

MAR 22 1926

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, July, and October; the REVIEW in the other eight months.

The Classical Review

EDITORS { E. HARRISON, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
Prof. W. M. CALDER, M.A., 5, Derby Road, Withington, Manchester.

All correspondence should be addressed to Prof. CALDER. Books for review should be sent to the Publisher.

Board of Management:

Prof. A. C. CLARE, Litt.D., F.R.A., Hon. Treasurer. L. WHIBLEY, M.A., Hon. Secretary.
Prof. B. S. CONWAY, Litt.D., F.R.A. With the Chairman, Treasurer, and Secretary, representing the Council of the Classical Association. J. P. POSTGATE, Litt.D., F.R.A. representing the Cambridge Philological Society.
Prof. H. WILLIAMSON, M.A. J. BELL, M.A., representing the Oxford Philological Society.

With the co-operation of Prof. WM. GARDNER HALE, University of Chicago;
Prof. MAURICE HUTTON, University of Toronto;
Prof. T. G. TUCKER, Litt.D., Melbourne.

Vol. XL

FEBRUARY-MARCH, 1926

Nos. 1, 2

CONTENTS

	PAGE		PAGE
NOTES AND NEWS	1	REVIEWS (continued):	
ARISTOPHANES AND AESCHYLUS. M. P. CHARLESWORTH	3	Some Greek volumes of the Loeb Library. E. HARRISON	24
IAN, IANEION, IANIKON. E. HARRISON	6	Liddell and Scott's <i>Greek Lexicon</i> , I. E. HARRISON	25
NOTES ON THE AGHNAION HOAITHEIA (continued). A. W. GOMME	8	<i>Papyri Osloenses</i> , I (Eitrem). A. D. NOCK	26
ANAGRAMS. J. F. DOBSON	12	<i>The Greeks in Spain</i> (Carpenter). E. W. V. CLIFTON	27
THE PROPOSED NEW DATE FOR IPSUS. W. W. TARN	13	The Metge Classics. W. J. ENTWISTLE	28
VERGIL'S FIRST Eclogue AND THE MIGRATION TO AFRICA. T. FRANK	15	School books. W. E. P. PANTIN	30
NOTES ON HORACE. D. L. DREW	16	Verses and translations. J. D. DUFF	32
THE PROEM OF LUCAN. A. D. NOCK	17	<i>Latin on the Direct Method</i> (Rouse and Appleton), <i>Primus Annus</i> (Paine and Mainwaring). E. V. ARNOLD	33
Lexical notes. W. M. CALDER	18	<i>Cortona</i> (Modona). R. A. L. FELL	34
Seneca, <i>Phaedra</i> , 85-88. J. S. PHILLIMORE	19	<i>Where Hannibal passed</i> (Bonus). C. TORR	35
Marital XII 59 g. A. E. HOUSMAN	19	<i>La letteratura latina</i> (Cocchia). J. WHATMOUGH	35
REVIEWS:		<i>Von den Ursachen der Grösse Roms</i> (Heinze). W. E. HEITLAND	36
<i>Our Debt to Greece and Rome: Mythology</i> (Harrison). D. BROOKE	19	<i>Saint-Augustin: Confessions</i> (de Labriolle). H. F. STEWART	37
<i>The Songs of Sappho</i> (Miller and Robinson). G. A. DAVIES	20	<i>Epistolae Erasmi</i> , V (Allen). G. C. RICHARDS	38
<i>Chronologie der altattischen Komödie</i> (Geissler). A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE	21	SHORT REVIEWS	39-45
<i>Aristophanes: his plays and his influence</i> (Lord). A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE	21	OXFORD PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY	45
<i>Aristotelianism</i> (Stocks). A. E. TAYLOR	22	SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS	45
<i>The pageant of Greece</i> (Livingstone), <i>Readings from the literature of Ancient Greece</i> (Pym). W. E. P. PANTIN	23	BOOKS RECEIVED	47

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.
NEW YORK: G. E. STECHERT & CO., 31-33, EAST 10TH STREET.

Price for Double Numbers, 3s. net. Yearly Subscription, 12s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$3.
Combined Yearly Subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 25s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$6.25.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices, provided that the subscriptions be paid before January 31st in each year. Subscriptions sent in later than that date must be at the rates offered to the general public.

Inquiries and applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Prof. H. A. Ormerod, 46, Cliff Road, Hyde Park, Leeds; or to either of the Hon. Secretaries, Dr. E. Norman Gardiner, 186, Woodstock Road, Oxford, and Mr. C. T. Seltman, Queens' College, Cambridge; or to the Hon. Secretary of any of the district Branches—viz., Mr. S. K. Johnson, The University, Manchester; Dr. G. A. Auden, Education Office, Margaret Street, Birmingham; Mr. M. M. Gillies, The University, Liverpool; Professor Granger, University College, Nottingham; Mr. R. W. Jackson, Cotham Secondary School, Bristol; Mr. Basil Anderton, The Public Library, New Bridge Street, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Miss E. J. Vaughan, Westfield College, Hampstead; Mr. W. E. Nash-Williams, University College, Cardiff; Mr. E. E. Bibby, The University, Leeds; Miss E. L. Topham, Firth Park Secondary School, Sheffield; Mr. E. D. T. Jenkins, University College, Aberystwyth; Miss M. E. Lees, University College, Bangor; Miss Leary, County School for Girls, Ashford; Mr. S. Price, 33, Walton Well Road, Oxford; Mr. J. M. Gaussen, 16, Lewes Crescent, Brighton; Mr. T. A. Sinclair, University College, Southampton; Mr. F. Fletcher, University College, Exeter; and Mr. C. W. Baty, 40, Waterloo Road, Bedford.

SMITH COLLEGE CLASSICAL STUDIES

No. 6. Catullus in English Poetry

(Imitations, Translations, Reminiscences of Catullus facing the Latin text)

By ELEANOR SHIPLEY DUCKETT, Ph.D., D.Lit.

In preparation

No. 7. Juno, A Study in Early Roman Religion

By EMILY LEDYARD SHIELDS, Ph.D.

EARLIER NUMBERS

1. "Hellenistic Influence on the Aeneid," by Eleanor Shipley Duckett.
2. "A Study in the Commerce of Latium," by Louise E. W. Adams.
3. "The Case-Construction after the Comparative in Pliny's Letters," by Gifford Foster Clark.
4. "Nicolaus of Damascus's Life of Augustus," by Clayton Morris Hall.
5. "Iphigenia at Aulis: Iphigenia among the Taurians," the lyric portions set to music, by Jane Peers Newhall.

Nos. 1-4, 6, 7, \$.75; No. 5, \$1.50.

Address orders to

Miss Mary Dunham, Librarian of Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

l
a
l
o
e

l
i.
s
l
l
e
t

e
;
k
e
e
t,
r,
l,
e-
h-
s;
T.
e,
3,
n,
er,

Sp
seco
cal
Janu
Mr.
give
over
hall
ing
audi
of c
cerit
exce
pres
the
had
life,
care
were
astio
of
wro
Tre
pres
welc
A
Soc
seen
Chi
elec
His
che
A
the
whi
and
Tay
try
del
roo
tine
or a
Th
Na
Lu
To
and
So

The Classical Review

FEBRUARY—MARCH, 1926

NOTES AND NEWS

Special interest attached to the twenty-second General Meeting of the Classical Association, which was held from January 7 to 9 in London. The fact that Mr. Baldwin was President, and was to give his presidential address, filled to overflowing the stately Elizabethan hall of the Middle Temple on the evening of Friday the 8th, and a delighted audience heard every word of a defence of classical education, which for sincerity and directness could not be excelled. Mr. Baldwin claimed to represent the ordinary man, and described the particular help and inspiration he had derived from the Classics in his life, and particularly in his political career. The thanks of the Association were voiced by Lord Finlay in enthusiastic language: Lord Sumner's touch of cynicism in seconding struck the wrong note. Mr. Justice Astbury, Treasurer of the Middle Temple, expressed the pleasure of the Society in welcoming the Prime Minister.

After this warm reception of the Society in a famous Inn of Court it seemed very appropriate that the Lord Chief Justice, Lord Hewart of Bury, was elected President for the ensuing year. His address will be delivered at Manchester on October 8 next.

Another interesting departure marked the other meetings of the Association, which, by the kindness of the Governors and Headmaster, were held at Merchant Taylors School. It was decided to try the experiment of sectional papers, delivered simultaneously in different rooms. To start with, the broad distinction between literary and historical or archaeological subjects was attempted. The readers were Professor Rose, Dr. Nairn, Mr. E. T. England, Rev. T. W. Lumb, Mr. F. Fletcher (Exeter), Mr. Tod, Mr. Mattingly, Professor Dobson, and Professor Granger (Nottingham). Some of the readers occupied too much

of the hour allotted, so that there was not sufficient time for discussion: otherwise the experiment seemed to justify itself and gave general satisfaction by the variety of subjects thus offered. Lantern lectures were delivered by Mr. A. J. B. Wace on the *Domed Tombs of Mycenae*, and Mr. C. T. Seltman, Joint Secretary, on *Greek Coins and History*. Professor H. Stuart Jones sent an admirable account of *The Making of a Lexicon*, which interested all its hearers who sympathised with the labours of a modern lexicographer in a great and much-needed undertaking. Professor Paul Mazon delivered an address in French on 'Science et Enseignement,' and a vote of thanks to him was proposed by Dr. Nairn in the same language. The success of the meeting was largely due to Dr. Nairn for his kind co-operation: thanks to him everything went smoothly and without a hitch.

In place of the retiring Treasurer, Professor Ormerod, Professor Smiley of University College, London, was elected; and in place of the retiring Secretary, Dr. G. C. Richards, Dr. E. Norman Gardiner, of 186, Woodstock Road, Oxford, was chosen. The vacancies on the Council were filled by Professor Ormerod, Dr. Richards, Canon Cruickshank, Miss Leary, and Mr. H. F. Hose of Dulwich College.

A pleasant feature of the meeting was the telegram of good wishes from Dean West on behalf of the American Classical League, and the reading of the annual American letter from Professor W. P. Mustard of Johns Hopkins University. For the promotion of international relations it would be a good thing if a scholar from a country not represented hitherto were invited to Manchester.

SCHOLARS are indebted to the Association of University Teachers for the

inauguration of a scheme which will be of great advantage even to those within reach of well-equipped libraries. The majority of the University libraries, and a number of other libraries, in Great Britain — the exceptions are mainly those libraries whose regulations forbid them to lend books — have agreed to a generous measure of inter-library lending. With the help of a grant from the Carnegie Trust, a central office has been established in Birmingham, under the supervision of Professor Sandbach, the ἀρχὴ κινήσεως of the whole movement; and a user of any University library may send a post-card to this office, and consult it regarding the whereabouts of any book he may be unable to find in his own library. In about a week he may expect to hear that a copy of the book is in the library of this or that University or Society, and can be sent to his librarian if applied for. Various classes of books, such as works of reference, standard works in constant use, and periodicals — such as the *Classical Review* — which ought to be in every learned library, are naturally excluded from the operation of the scheme. Enquiries should be addressed to Mr. L. T. Oldaker, The University Library, Edmund Street, Birmingham.

The Dean of the Graduate School of Yale University invites us to call the attention of our readers to the newly established Sterling Fellowships, which are open to persons desirous of pursuing research in Humanistic Studies as well as in the Natural Sciences. The Fellowships are tenable by foreigners; they are divided into a Senior and a Junior class, the dividing line between the two classes being the American Ph.D. or an equivalent qualification. The Yale Graduate School needs no advertisement in the *Classical Review*. Young British graduates, or older classical scholars with a free year on their hands, will find there both books and shrewd advice on their use. Further particulars may be obtained from the Dean of the Graduate School, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut.

Professor E. A. Sonnenschein calls attention to the *Lexicon Plautinum*, by Professor Gonzalez Lodge, of Columbia University, U.S.A. (Vol. I., A-L, pp. 917; Teubner, 1914-1924; 10 fascicules, each 7.20 marks, unbound):

'The completion of the first volume of this monumental and unique lexicon to Plautus calls for a brief record in these columns. Such a work has been a desideratum for a century; the seventeenth-century lexicon of Pareus is quite inadequate to modern needs. The present work, to which Professor Lodge has devoted over thirty years of labour, is thoroughly up to date, and indispensable to the student of Old Latin. Those who have already purchased the earlier parts should see to it that they get (*free of charge*) the reprint of the first two parts (*A to alius* and *alius to aufugio*) supplied with Part X. The second volume will now follow at a greatly accelerated pace.'

The Years' Work in Classical Studies, 1924-1925, edited by D. S. Robertson, has appeared. Back numbers of this annual can be obtained for 2s. 6d. each from Messrs. Arrowsmith, 11, Quay Street, Bristol.

From a Cambridge correspondent:

'The Classical Tripos thrives. The present system not only allows a large number of men and women to round off their school studies of the classics, but maintains the interests of the fit during the whole of their University time; and the fit are no longer few. The fears that followed the war have fallen away. Part I., which had only 78 candidates two years ago, reached a peak last year with 117; this year it has 105. There are substitutes (some of them thought to be easy) for verse composition; yet about half the students offer verses in both Latin and Greek. For Part II., the higher course, the candidates were no more than 36 two years ago; last year they were 50; and they are no fewer than 70 for the Tripos of next June. The schedule allows a choice of special subject (a group) for two papers out of seven. The most popular group is History, but Philosophy is close behind; Criticism and Archaeology follow *longo intervallo*; "Language" also runs, or crawls.'

MR. E. H. BLAKENEY writes:

'It is just a century ago this year that John Conington was born; and his birth-year coin-

cides with that of William Young Sellar. Both these fine and discriminating scholars were distinguished by their work on Virgil. It is not exactly to the credit of English scholarship that no complete edition of Virgil, on the grand scale, has been issued since Conington published his well-known work (1863-1871). Has not the time come when the reproach should be lifted, and an edition published worthy of the greatest of Roman poets? No doubt it would be, in some ways, a formidable undertaking; but it can and ought to be carried through. J. E. B. Mayor long ago (Preface to the 1886 edition of Juvenal) indicated the lines on which an adequate edition should be undertaken. Here are (*mutatis mutandis*) some of his words: "The Universities might issue an edition, not on the Dutch plan, but more concise and more comprehensive at the same time. Two or three [editors] might combine: one colleague might be responsible for all editions of the author, while two others ransacked periodical and occasional literature, '*variae lectiones*,' *adversaria*, etc." I should like to see Conington made a basis for the new work; the editor-in-chief being responsible for working in all new (or recovered) matter. Such an edition might well contain the *Culex* and the rest of the "minor works," which were not included in Conington. The format of the new book could well improve on Conington; all critical matter to be placed in the *apparatus criticus*, which should be kept within strictly moderate limits. And the book ought surely to contain *full* indices. Kennedy's single-volume Virgil is extremely useful in this respect, and his example may well be followed. A mass of valuable matter has been got together during the last half-century—Henry's *Aeneidea*, Warde Fowler's monographs, are instances. Minor works, like those of Page and Sidgwick, would yield helpful suggestions. If Mr. J. W. Mackail could be persuaded to act as editor-in-chief, so much the better, for his literary instinct is impeccable."

DR. T. RICE HOLMES writes:

'Dr. E. C. Nischer of Vienna has communicated to me the sad news that Colonel Veith was murdered at the end of August, in the neighbourhood of Zela, whither he had gone to explore. Students of ancient military history will deplore his loss, for he had done much excellent work, and, as he was still in middle age, there was reason to hope that he would do much more. In the notice that appeared in the *Classical Review* (XXXVI., 1922, pp. 89-90) of his last book, *Der Feldzug von Dyrrhachium zwischen Caesar und Pompeius* (in recognition of which he received—I think from the University of Münster—a doctor's degree), three of his earlier writings were honourably mentioned; and his admirable treatise on the campaigns of Octavian in Illyricum, published by the Balkan-kommission in 1914, should have been added to the list. The substance of this treatise has been incorporated, together with other contributions from his pen, in the *Schlachten-Atlas zur antiken Kriegsgeschichte*, which he edited conjointly with Professor Kromayer. Within the last two years he wrote, after personal examination of the terrain, on the operations of Scipio and Domitius Calvinus in the valley of the Aliacmon (Vistritza) and on the topography of the battle of Pharsalus, in regard to which he told me that he accepted, as I had done, the view of Mr. F. L. Lucas, but with 'kleine Abweichungen.' This paper had not yet been published when he last wrote to me. Towards the end he was collaborating with Dr. Nischer on the chapter *Das römische Heerwesen* for the new edition of Müller's *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft*.

Having been invited to contribute to the *Schlachten-Atlas*, I have had much correspondence with Colonel Veith in the last few years, and, though I had never met him, his letters inspired me with feelings of friendship, which were gradually ripening into affection. As Dr. Nischer wrote at the end of his letter, "He was a very good friend."

ARISTOPHANES AND AESCHYLUS.

ONE of the most famous and delightful scenes in Aristophanes' comedies is that in which Aeschylus and Euripides contend for the Chair of Tragedy before the unintelligent Dionysus. We can still appreciate much of the humour, and the wit has not evaporated even after two thousand years; yet we can scarcely flatter ourselves that we are such *δεξιὸι θεαταί* as Aristophanes found the Athenians; we cannot expect to understand now all the topical hints and allusions; the musical criticism especially, as Professor Murray says, 'remains above our heads.' Many of the references and jests are laboriously explained for us by

the scholia; others we have to puzzle out for ourselves, but the effort is worth making if we are to appreciate the art of Aristophanes. My purpose in this article is to offer explanations of one or two points which seem so far to have escaped notice. In general it may be well to remark that the prevailing impression that Aristophanes is always on the side of Aeschylus and the angels is somewhat exaggerated: it is obvious that he prefers Aeschylus and dislikes the new methods and the realism of Euripides, but he is above all a *γελωτοποιός*, and is ready to direct his shaft even against his hero occasionally

if only he can raise a laugh. We need not think that a poet who could put Dionysus himself in such ridiculous positions and involve the god in such buffoonery would have scrupled to point to defects in Aeschylus or to ridicule some of his more notorious mannerisms.

I propose to consider four passages. In the first, Dionysus, speaking to Aeschylus, who has broken out in fury against Euripides, quenches his tirade with the words

παῦ', Αἰσχόλε,
καὶ μὴ πρὸς ὀργὴν σπλάγχνα θερμήνῃς κότῳ
(Il. 843-4).

Now line 844 is obviously tragic burlesque or *paratragic*, as most of the critics have seen: it is not the way in which a comic poet says normally 'Don't get angry.' But it is more than mere burlesque: it is patently a quotation from some tragic poet. Van Leeuwen with his usual insight perceived this and attributed the phrase to Euripides. The whole scene is full of such quotations, mockingly applied: Aeschylus in line 840 parodies a verse of Euripides (ἄλῃθες, ὦ παῖ τῆς ἀρουραίας θεοῦ;), and there are many such. But there would be far more point in Dionysus silencing Aeschylus with one of his own verses, and that is what I would suggest he does. The whole phrase smacks of Aeschylus: the word *κότος* is decisive; it occurs altogether twenty-three times in the plays and fragments of the poet, and is a favourite word of his: it never occurs at all in Sophocles, and only twice in Euripides, first in the doubtful *Rhesus*, and again in a passage of the satyr-play, the *Cyclops*, to which I shall revert. Furthermore the word *σπλάγχνα* comes frequently in Aeschylus, and in line 1006 the poet is made to say *θυμούμαι μὲν τῇ ξυντυχίᾳ καὶ μου τὰ σπλάγχνα ἄγανακτεῖ*. I suggest that the phrase *καὶ μὴ πρὸς ὀργὴν σπλάγχνα θερμήνῃς κότῳ* is a fragment of Aeschylus and would have been recognised by the audience as typically Aeschylean: and I would suggest further that it had been delightfully parodied by Euripides in the *Cyclops* (by the change of but one letter), where Odysseus, describing how he made the Cyclops drunk, says:

ἐγὼ δ' ἐπερχέων
ἄλλην ἐπ' ἄλλῃ σπλάγχχον ἐθέρμαινον ποτῶ
(Il. 423-4).

(Just so, earlier in the same drama Euripides, at line 218, *μήλειον ἢ βόειον ἢ μεμιγμένον*, unkindly parodies the strange phrase in the *Prometheus*, line 116, *θεόστυτος ἢ βρότειος ἢ κεκραμένη*). Thus Dionysus quashes Aeschylus with one of his own magniloquent lines, a line too already parodied by Euripides.

Before the contest begins each poet is bidden by Dionysus to make a prayer. The words put into the mouth of Euripides (*αἰθέρ, ἐμὸν βόσκημα, καὶ γλώττης στρόφιγγε* κτλ.) are an obvious burlesque of his characters' philosophising and a gibe at his own 'advanced' views. Aeschylus, however, is made to say

Δήμητερ, ἢ θρέψασα τὴν ἐμὴν φρένα,
εἶναι με τῶν σὺν ἄξιον μυστηρίων
(Il. 885-6),

and this is usually accepted by commentators as the orthodox prayer of the model poet, of whom Aristophanes entirely approves. But is this so certain? To be sure Aeschylus hailed from Eleusis, but if Aristophanes meant the prayer to be taken *au grand sérieux* is it not a little unfortunate that he should have put such an appeal to Demeter into the mouth of a man who had been suspected and even accused of divulging the mysteries? This is no place to go into the question whether Aeschylus had been initiated or not, but we do know, on the unimpeachable authority of Aristotle,¹ that on being charged with divulging the mysteries he pleaded ignorance. Later authors tell us he was acquitted, and Clement of Alexandria says expressly that he was acquitted because he proved he had never been initiated, *ἐπιδείξας αὐτὸν μὴ μεμνημένον*.² But whatever be the precise truth about the issue of the trial, there is no doubt that Aeschylus was not initiated and that he was suspected of having divulged the mysteries,³ and it is as ludicrous for Aristophanes to make Aeschylus pray to Demeter as it would be for Drinkwater to make Dryden, after his lapse from Cambridge and from Protestantism, cry, 'To Hell with the Pope!' I suggest that these two lines are also a fragment of Aes-

¹ Aristotle, *Ethics*, III. 1111a 10.

² Clem. Alex. *Stromat.* II. 60, 3.

³ Wilamowitz accepts the story in his *Aeschylus*, and he is not usually so conservative.

chylus and are applied to him in jest by Aristophanes.

Towards the end of the contest Dionysus is still perplexed which poet to choose. As one test he requests each to state his opinion of Alcibiades and the best way in which to treat him. Euripides, who twenty years ago had written a triumphal ode for him, replies in three scathing lines: Aeschylus delivers himself thus:

οὐ χρὴ λέοντος σκύμνον ἐν πόλει τρέφειν
μάλιστα μὲν λέοντα μὴ 'ν πόλει τρέφειν
ἦν δ' ἐκτραφῇ τις, τοῖς τρώποις ὑπηρετεῖν
(ll. 1431-3).

There is unfortunately doubt as to the reading, and some editors bracket line 1431. This seems unnecessary, for the λέοντος σκύμνον is certainly a reminiscence of the famous λέοντος ἱνὺν of the *Agamemnon*, and the whole line (as Hermann and van Leeuwen saw) smacks of Aeschylus. But there may be more in the passage still. Alcibiades belonged to the clan of the Eupatrids on his father's side: these Eupatrids, as Toepffer¹ has shown, claimed descent from Orestes, the εὐπατρίδης. Now a lion appears to have been the badge of the Pelopid house from which they pretended descent: the Lion-Gate is one of the monuments of that house; in literature, Aeschylus in his *Oresteia* makes frequent reference to members of it under the simile of lions;² on an Athenian hydria Agamemnon is depicted with the badge of a lion upon his shield.³ A lion is, of course, a very common heraldic device, but a member of the Eupatrid clan would appear to have a right to such a badge, and we have an anecdote of Alcibiades' youth which perhaps refers to this. In a wrestling match he was being worsted by his opponent, and in order to free himself bit into his arm: his opponent released his grip and sneered 'What, Alcibiades, biting like a woman?' 'No,' retorted Alcibiades, 'like a lion.'⁴ We do know too that Alcibiades made a change in the ancestral device on his

shield, and gave himself as crest an Eros bearing a torch, and that this change and device alike shocked elderly opinion.⁵ I would suggest that the badge of Cleinias, his father, was a lion, and that Aristophanes, by using the phrase λέοντος σκύμνον, makes a very apt allusion to Alcibiades and his family crest, an allusion that could not have been missed by the audience. Similarly, in the *Lysistrata* (l. 664) Aristophanes makes an allusion to the crest of the Alcmaeonidae, and I believe the allusion to Alcibiades would have been palpable.

But even after the delivery of these two opinions poor Dionysus remains nonplussed: he still cannot make up his mind which poet to choose:

ὁ μὲν σοφῶς γὰρ εἶπεν, ὁ δ' ἕτερος σαφῶς
(l. 1434).

Some of Dionysus' perplexity appears to have been transmitted to the commentators; the scholia declare that Aeschylus speaks σοφῶς and Euripides σαφῶς. Meineke actually changed σαφῶς to σοφῶς, and most editors remain cautiously indefinite. Yet the answer should be plain, for Aristophanes throughout his works regards Euripides as the 'clever,' 'smart,' brilliant but pernicious dramatist, and applies σοφός to him continually. Compare these passages:

ὦ τρισμακάρι' Εὐριπίδῃ,
δδ' ὁ δούλος οὔτωσι σοφῶς ἀπεκρίνατο
(*Ach.*, ll. 400-1).

πῶς ἂν ὁδὸν ποτε
εἴποιμ' ἂν αὐτὸ δῆτα κομψευρικῶς;
(*Equit.*, ll. 17-18).

οὐκ οὐν δικαίως, ὅστις οὐκ Εὐριπίδην ἐπαινεῖς
σοφώτατον;
(*Nub.*, ll. 1377-8).

οὐκ ἔστ' ἀνὴρ Εὐριπίδου σοφώτερος ποιητής
(*Lysist.*, l. 368).

ὑπερεμάνησαν κἀνόμισαν σοφώτατον
(*Ranae*, l. 776).

It is Euripides who is the brilliant poet, the δεξιὸς ποιητής of whom Dionysus is in search, hailed by him as σοφωτάτη φύσις.⁶ So brilliant indeed is he that Dionysus cannot always follow him, and on one occasion has to request him to speak ἀμαθέστερον καὶ σαφέστερον⁷—a passage which should

¹ Toepffer, *Att. Genealogie*, pp. 176 ff.

² Aeschylus, *Agam.* 1224, 1258-9; *Choeph.* 938 (Oxford text).

³ G. H. Chase, *Harvard Studies*, 1902, p. 112.

⁴ Plutarch, *Alcib.* 2.

⁵ *Ibid.* 16.

⁶ Aristophanes, *Ranae*, 71 and 1451, and cf. *Thesmoph.* 21, 22 and 93, 94.

⁷ *Ibid.* 1445.

be decisive. And his verdict on Alcibiades, though pungent and antithetical, is of little practical use or meaning, whereas Aeschylus is perfectly clear and explicit. 'Better not rear an Alcibiades in your state; but if you have done so, you must put up with him.' Athens is

to use him and to employ her best men irrespective of their past or party. This is sound and clear advice. And if my suggestion as to λέοντος σκύμνον is correct, Aeschylus' meaning is doubly clear. It is he who speaks σαφώς, and Euripides merely σοφώς.

M. P. CHARLESWORTH.

IIAN, IIANEION, IIANIKON.

How old is the association of Pan with groundless fear? In an unguarded moment one might point to the Homeric Hymn or to Herodotus; indeed, some scholars do refer to Herodotus for just this thing. Now Herodotus is one of my chief witnesses, but not for that.

In the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* the name of Pan does not occur. The *Hymn to Pan* says much of mirth but nothing of fear, save that his nurse at his birth fled in terror of his bearded face. The Hesiodic poems say nought of Pan, and the powers of fear whom they mention,¹ as far as they have any being, are children of Ares and Aphrodite, and have nothing to do with Pan.

Let us turn to Herodotus. On the eve of Marathon, we read,² Pan told Philippides that he had done good service to Athens, and would do more. The Athenians showed their gratitude by building him a shrine when their affairs had turned out well. Yet what service he did them we are not told. Neither in his story of Marathon nor elsewhere does Herodotus ascribe any discomfiture of the Persians to Pan. Stranger still, when he tells us how fear once fell upon the Persians by night, he says nothing of Pan. When Xerxes and his host came to the Scamander, they did homage to Athena and the Heroes: ταῦτα δὲ ποιησαμένοιισι νυκτὸς φόβος ἐς τὸ στρατόπεδον ἐνέπεσε.³ That is all. Not πανικός φόβος, but just fear.

From Marathon and the Scamander let us pass to Salamis. As Herodotus tells the story we hear nothing of Pan or of panic; indeed, apart from the Persians' wholesome dread of their lord and master,⁴ the only combatant to

whom he ascribes fear of any kind is not a Persian but a Greek.⁵

In Herodotus, though gods and heroes, oracles and soothsayers, play their part, the battle is in the main an affair between men and men. In Aeschylus, on the other hand, the work of the gods is seen at every turn.

ἀλλ' ὥδε δαίμων τις κατέφθειρε στρατὸν,
τάλαντα βρίας οὐκ ἰσορρόπῃ τήχῃ.
θεοὶ πόλιν σφύζουσι Παλλάδος θιάς.

ἦρξεν μὲν, ὃ δίσποινα, τοῦ παντὸς κακοῦ
φανείς ἀλάστωρ ἢ κακὸς δαίμων ποθὲν.

οὐ ξυνεῖς δόλον
"Ελληνος ἀνδρὸς οὐδὲ τὸν θεῶν φθόνον.

οὐ γὰρ τὸ μέλλον ἐκ θεῶν ἠπίστατο.

θεός
ναῶν ἔδωκε κῦδος "Ελλήσιν μάχης.⁶

Moreover, the mood of the Persians is fear from the very outset,⁷ and when things go against them their flight is wild.⁸ Xerxes also, when he sees the defeat from the shore, rushes in disorderly flight.⁹ Here, if anywhere, we might look for the work of Pan; and the poet might even be thought, by his conduct of the story, to be leading up to Pan. The Messenger tells his tale of disaster, and adds that there is worse, far worse, to follow. 'What *could* be worse?' asks the Queen; and he enters on the last stage of horror.¹⁰

νησός τις ἴσσι πρόσθε Σαλαμῖνος τόπων,
βαῖά, δύσσορμος ναυσίν, ἦν ὁ φιλόχορος
Πάν ἱμβατεύει.

He takes us to Psytaleia, the haunt of Pan. Yet of any influence of Pan on the issue of the battle he says not a word.

If arguments from silence are ever to have value, I infer that Aeschylus and

¹ *Shield*, 154; *Theogony*, 933.

² vi. 105.

³ vii. 43.

viii. 86.

⁵ viii. 94, 1.

⁶ *Persae*, 345, 353, 361, 373, 454.

⁷ 391.

⁸ 422.

⁹ 470.

¹⁰ 447.

Herodotus did not associate Pan with fear.¹

Thucydides, like Herodotus, can describe the nocturnal terrors of armies without recourse to Pan:

'When night came on, the Macedonians and most of the barbarians at once took alarm, as it is the way of large armies to feel inexplicable dismay; and thinking that their assailants were many times more numerous than was the fact, and that they were all but upon them, they took to sudden flight.'

'They lit many fires and set out through the night; and disorder fell upon them, as it is the way of all armies, and especially of the largest, to suffer alarms and terrors, and above all at night, on the enemy's soil, with the enemy not far away.'²

First by Euripides is Pan associated with any baneful emotion. In the *Medea*³ the Messenger supposes the bride's malady to be due to 'the wrath of Pan or some god.' In the *Hippolytus*⁴ the Chorus name Pan, Hecate, the Corybantes, and the Mountain Mother, as possible authors of the illness of the

Queen. In neither place is the emotion fear.

First in the *Rhesus*, a play of doubtful date and authorship, does Pan seem to be associated with fear:⁵

τὰ μὲν ἀγγίλλεις δέματ' ἀκοίειν,
τὰ δὲ θαρσύνεις, κούδεν καθαρῶς.
ἀλλ' ἢ Κρονίου Πανὸς τρομερᾶ
μάστιγι φοβῆ;

There the adjective τρομερᾶ helps. But in Polybius, Cicero, and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, the noun πανικόν means by itself, without help from the context, groundless fear.⁶ Diodorus, Josephus, Plutarch, and Pausanias, have not that noun, but they give the same sense by combining the adjective πανικός with such nouns as φόβος, θόρυβος, δέσμα and ταραχος. Doubtless these authors connected πανικόν and πανικός with Pan, but first in Plutarch is the connexion expressly alleged.⁷

If my inference from the silence of Aeschylus and Herodotus is right, how had πανικόν, by the time of Polybius, come to convey the sense of *panic fear*?

Perhaps a clue may be found in the word πάνειον, which is used twice by Aeneas the Tactician, a writer of the middle of the fourth century before Christ, but apparently nowhere else in all Greek. I quote the passages of Aeneas from the text contributed to the Loeb Library by the Illinois Greek Club.

(C. xxi.) Περὶ δὲ φυλάκων καταστάσεως καὶ περιδοειῶν καὶ πανείων καὶ συνθημάτων καὶ παρασυνθημάτων τὰ μὲν πολλὰ ἐν τῇ Στρατοπεδευτικῇ βίβλῳ γραπτέον ὃν τρόπον δεῖ γενέσθαι, ὁλίγα δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ νῦν δηλώσομεν.

Here, if one knew nothing about πάνειον or πανικόν, one might well take πάνειον, or rather πανεῖον, to mean a fire-signal, and to be derived from πανός,

¹ The Simonidean epigram (*Anth. Plan.* 232) supposes Pan to have aided Athens at Marathon, as *Mitridæus* shows; so do Theaetetus in the following poem (233), Lucian (*Philops.* 3, *Bis Acc.* 9, *Deor. Dial.* 22. 3), Pausanias (i. 28. 4, cf. viii. 54. 6), Libanius (v. 40, xxx. 32), and Nonnus (*Dionys.* xxvii. 299 ff.). So far as I know, only a scholion on Sophocles (*Ajax* 695) suggests that he played his part at Salamis. Even Plutarch's story of the fight on Psyttaleia (*Aristid.* ix.) says nothing of Pan. The pseudo-theocritean *Syrinx* (9-10) does not commit itself to a place. None of these passages suggests that Pan struck panic into the foe.—Eratosthenes, it seems, made Pan strike 'terrorem qui πανικός dicitur' into the Titans in their fight with the Gods (*Hygin. Astron.* ii. 25); and in Polyænus (*Strat.* i. 2) Pan, as the στρατηγός of Dionysus, frightens the enemy by a ruse, whence τοὺς κενούς καὶ τοὺς νυκτερινούς τῶν στρατευμάτων φόβους Πανὶ <κοῦς> κληῖζομεν.

² iv. 125. 1; vii. 80. 3. W. Schmid (*Rhein. Mus.*, 1895, p. 311) has no doubt that Thucydides in both places is combating the ascription of such terrors to Pan. If a similar inference is to be drawn from every sententious passage of Thucydides, there will be a god under every stone.—Xenophon does not seem to help. He does not mention in any terms (*Hell.* ii. 4) the θόρυβος ὁ καλούμενος Πανικός which in Diodorus (xiv. 32. 3) comes upon the troops of the Thirty before Phyle.

³ 1172.

⁴ 142.

⁵ 34.

⁶ An earlier instance of the noun, if we can trust Athenæus (389 f), is *Περὶ τοῦ Πανικοῦ*, the title of a treatise of Clearchus, a disciple of Aristotle. This treatise is otherwise unknown, and what Athenæus quotes, though it might have served by way of illustration in a scientific account of panics, resembles what he quotes from another treatise by Clearchus in 393a. This, and the singular, throw doubt on *Περὶ τοῦ Πανικοῦ*.

⁷ *De Iside et Osiride* 14 (356D). Compare Pausanias x. 23. 7.

a word which a passage of Athenaeus¹ has restored to Aeschylus² and Euripides.³

But in the second passage of Aeneas the word clearly means *panic*:

(C. xxvii.) Τὸν δὲ περὶ πόλιν ἡ στρατόπεδα ἐξαίφνης θορύβους καὶ φόβους γενομένους⁴ νυκτὸς ἢ μεθ' ἡμέραν, ἅπερ ὑπὸ τινῶν καλεῖται πάνεια (ἔστιν δὲ τὸ ὄνομα Πελοποννήσιον καὶ μάλιστα Ἀρκαδικόν), πρὸς ταύτ' οὖν τινες κελεύουσιν, καταπαύειν θέλοντες αὐτά, προσυγκεῖσθαι τοῖς ἐν τῇ πόλει σημεῖα, ἃ ἰδόντες γινώσκονται· γινώσκονται δὲ ὅτι ἔστιν πάνειον ὧδε· αἰσθάνονται διὰ πυρός τι προσυγκείμενον ἐπὶ χώρου εὐκατόπτου πᾶσιν εἰς δύναμιν τοῖς ἐν τῇ πόλει. ἄριστον δὲ προπαρηγγέλθαι, καθ' οὓς ἂν τῶν στρατιωτῶν γένηται φόβος, κατὰ χώραν τε ἡρμεῖν καὶ ἀναβοᾶν παιᾶνα, ἢ λέγειν ὅτι εἴη πάνειον καὶ τὸν ἀκούοντα αἰετῇ πλησίον παραγγέλλειν. καθ' οὓς ἂν τοῦ στρατεύματος μὴ ἀντιπαιανίζωσιν, εἰδέναι κατὰ τούτους τὸν φόβον ὄντα.

The Greek is poor, and the text perhaps corrupt: but *πάνειον* denotes panic, and one of the ways of dealing with panic is a *fire-signal*, the meaning which we should assign to the word in the previous passage if that passage

were to be taken by itself. How can we reconcile the two passages?

I conjecture that *πανεῖον* originally meant *fire-signal*, being related to *πανός* as *λυχνεῖον* is to *λύχνος*; that in Arcadia, the Peloponnese, and elsewhere, it came to be used in particular of a fire-signal announcing a groundless terror among troops; and that thence it came to mean such a terror itself. The history of the word would then resemble that of *alarm*, which from meaning a *call to arms* has come to be synonymous with *fear*.

The change in the meaning of *πανεῖον*, a specially Arcadian word, may have been helped by a mistaken connexion with Πάν, the god of Arcady; but it is also possible that the special use of *πανεῖον* contributed to the change by which Pan came to be regarded as the author of fear.

Even the form *πανικόν* may owe something to *πανεῖον*. Without some such help, how did that neuter adjective pass into a noun?⁵

⁵ Since Antigonos Gonatas is much later than Aeneas, I need not consider the suppositions that panic helped him to defeat the Gauls at Lysimachia, and that this panic came into the hymn of Aratus in praise of Pan (H. Usener, *Kleine Schriften*, iii., pp. 405 ff.; W. W. Tarn, *Antigonos Gonatas*, pp. 165, 174). Justin, who alone gives us details of the fight, says nothing of panic or of Pan.

E. HARRISON.

NOTES ON THE ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ.

(Continued from Vol. XXXIX., p. 154.)

24. 3 ἐπεὶ συνεστήσαντο τὸν πόλεμον ὕστερον, ὁπλῆται μὲν διαχίλιοι καὶ πεντακῆσοι, νῆες δὲ φρουρίδες εἰκοσι, κ.τ.λ.

That this whole section on the 20,000 citizens who live at ease (*εὐπορία τροφῆς*) at the expense of the state is of a highly rhetorical character should not be denied. The flourish at the end, *ἔτι δὲ πρυτανεῖον καὶ ὀρφανοὶ, καὶ δεσμωτῶν φύλακες*, is sufficient to establish that; where the *ὀρφανοὶ* are minors and so not citizens, and the prison-guards are either the Eleven (so Sandys), in which case they should have been already included under the *ἀρχαὶ ἐνδημοί*, or slaves, and in any case would constitute a very negligible addition to the

total. The passage shows considerable, if perverted, learning, and strong political bias; it is based on genuine fifth-century evidence, but it is collected from isolated statements by fifth-century authors, of various dates and not all of equal value; some, at least, come from comedy. I suspect the collector to have been Theopompus. But an author, however rhetorical, will keep within some limit. Why should anyone, however much opposed to democracy or socialism, be angry because an army and a navy are paid by the state in time of war? And if this writer did object, why does he give 2,500 hoplites only, not the full force,

and twenty guard-ships only instead of the whole navy?¹ These objections seem to me fatal to the MS. reading; we must alter to τὰ εἰς τὸν πόλεμον, as Kaibel first proposed,² and read συνέστησαν, as Mr. Harrison suggests to me, for συνεστήσαντο, in order that we may understand these items as part of the standing military force in peace-time. There would still remain an exaggeration—'preparations for the war,' the Peloponnesian, as though all Athenian efforts for years before 431 had this end consciously in view; but that is in the style of this chapter.

Ibid. ἄλλαι δὲ νῆες αἱ τοὺς φόρους ἄγουσαι τοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ κυάμου δισχιλίους ἄνδρας.

Editors have dealt with this passage in three different ways: (1) Some alter φόρους to φρουρούς with Blass; others keep φόρους and assume a lacuna after ἄγουσαι, and either (2) suppose that only one item is given in the whole sentence ἄλλαι . . . ἄνδρας, and would insert φέρουσαι (Colin), or simply καί (Mathieu and Haussoullier: 'd'autres navires portant les tributs avec deux mille hommes tirés au sort'); or (3) suppose that the ships and the 2,000 men are two separate items (Kaibel and Wilamowitz). Only Kenyon leaves the text as it is, and translates: 'Other ships which collected the tributes, with crews amounting to 2,000 men selected by lot.' I do not know how he gets this from the Greek. The objection to (3) is that the items we already have in the text give a total of about 19,750,³ to which the prytaneum,

orphans, and prison-guards have to be added. Also ships escorting the allies' tribute would not especially have been manned by citizens, and would not have been active for more than a month or so in the spring; to suggest the contrary would be extravagant even for the author of this chapter. This last point is against both (2) and (3). The objection to (1) is that in this way the number 2,000 is made to refer to the men (whether φρουροί or others) carried by the ships and not to the ships' crews. This is impossible. Clearly the author is here enumerating seamen (as Wilamowitz saw, II. 205. 7), and the land-troops have already been given. This objection also applies to the insertion of καί, which anyhow produces a very improbable sentence.

We must, I think, give up φόρους for the reason given above, and adopt Blass' φρουρούς. This will involve only a slight further change to make the figure refer to the crews and not to the passengers of these vessels—namely, <ἐς> δισχιλίους ἄνδρας. If we keep φόρους and translate 'ships escorting the tribute with a crew of 2,000' (we must not say 'collecting the tribute' or refer to the νῆες ἀργυρολόγοι, unless we are prepared to depart from the historical facts), we should still insert ἐς, and there will then be something wrong with τοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ κυάμου; or if we assume a lacuna and another item, then we want ἐς δισχ. ἄ. as the total of the two items.

If φρουρούς, or any other word of similar import, is right, we have here evidence, of a kind, that regular drafts were sent out to different parts of the

¹ Sandys adds these 2,500 to the 6,000 dicasts and 500 bouleutae, and finds the result to equal exactly the number of Athenians (according to Pausanias) who fought at Marathon; and adds the 700 home officials to that and gets a total only 300 less than the 10,000 Athenians who marched into the Megarid. Why not say also that the 6,000 dicasts are not far short of the number of hoplites who fought at Delion, and the 2,500 nearly equal to the number who fought at Chaeroneia? Were no dicasts over age, and none of them thetes?

² He later (*Stil u. Text*, p. 181) reverted to the MS. reading.

³ One must say 'about,' as the figure for the ἀρχαὶ ὑπερόριοι is corrupt; they may well have amounted to more than 700, as there were garrisons in some of the cities.

It is necessary, I think, to assume the full number of 4,000 for the twenty guard-ships, as

Kenyon. Without it we have no definite figure for this as for all the other items before the last three thrown in; and 4,000 brings the total near the desired 20,000. All we have to suppose is that there was some evidence that at some time in the fifth century twenty ships were kept in commission for some eight months in the year manned entirely by citizens; just as Plutarch (*Per.* 11), and he alone, had evidence that 60 ships were kept in commission largely manned by citizens. It is not necessary for us to believe either statement if we think probability is against them. Both may, however, be true for different times during Pericles' rule, or soon after.

It is curious that no special mention is made here of the Paralos and the Salaminia.

Empire, and a squadron kept in constant readiness for their transport and supply. Also such ships would be required as much in peace time as in war, which increases the need for reading τὰ εἰς τὸν πόλεμον above.

32. 3. γενομένης δὲ ταύτης τῆς πολιτείας οἱ μὲν πεντακισχίλιοι λόγῳ μόνον ἡρέθησαν, οἱ δὲ τετρακόσιοι μετὰ τῶν δέκα τῶν αὐτοκρατόρων εἰσελθόντες εἰς τὸ βουλευτήριον ἤρχον τῆς πόλεως.

It is generally, and not unnaturally, supposed that this board of ten men with full powers are the ten strategoi αὐτοκράτορες of 31. 2. But it is to be noticed that these are only to serve 'with full powers' for the following year, after being chosen by the new Boule of 400; and that they are not here called strategoi (as they are in 31. 3), the regular name for a well-known office.

Now, while there are many discrepancies between Aristotle and Thucydides in their accounts of the various proposals made by the oligarchs, there are no great differences in their narrative of events. The chief of these latter are: (1) In Thucydides there are ten ξυγγραφεῖς αὐτοκράτορες elected to draw up the new constitution (VIII. 67. 1), in Aristotle a body of 30 (20 ξυγγραφεῖς and the already existing ten πρόβουλοι); (2) the method in which, apparently, the 400 were elected (Thuc. 67. 3 and *Ath. Pol.* 31. 1); and (3) in Aristotle the 5,000 are chosen and act (30. 1, 32. 1), in Thucydides, before the overthrow of the 400, they exist on paper only.

But after the first sentence of c. 32 Aristotle agrees much more closely with Thucydides: he returns to a narrative the basis of which is Thucydides. Most noticeable of all is his contradiction of his own account of the 5,000: οἱ πεντακισχίλιοι λόγῳ μόνον ἡρέθησαν, just as in 32. 1 ἐπικυρωθέντων δὲ τούτων ὑπὸ τοῦ πλήθους (not ὑπὸ τῶν πεντακισχιλίων) he has already by implication adopted an account more nearly agreeing with Thucydides (67. 2, 69. 1). Then, as to the second of the differences noted above, we are actually only given the method of election proposed; we are not told that this method was adopted, though in a more carefully written book than the *Ath. Pol.*

we should assume this. We need not, therefore, regard it as very important.

This leaves us with discrepancy No. 1, concerning the ξυγγραφεῖς αὐτοκράτορες. Cary has shown (*J.H.S.* XXXIII., 1913, pp. 6 ff.) that, since Aristotle must be wrong in saying that the 5,000 were actually chosen and transacted business during the rule of the Four Hundred, 'the constitutions which presuppose them must be rejected likewise. . . . Aristotle's two constitutions (cc. 30 and 31) do not belong to the context into which they have been inserted, and their author did not know how the Four Hundred were really constituted.' But the ten στρατηγοὶ αὐτοκράτορες of 31. 2 are part of the second of these two constitutions (the provisional one), and must disappear with it. Since then, in c. 32 (after the first sentence), Aristotle is following a narrative which largely agrees with Thucydides, it is probable that οἱ δέκα οἱ αὐτοκράτορες of 32. 3 are not the στρατηγοὶ of 31. 2, but the ten ξυγγραφεῖς αὐτοκράτορες of Thucydides, the commission of thirty being ignored, so that we should have here another of those silent inconsistencies of which the *Ath. Pol.* is full. This does not necessarily mean that Thucydides is right and the first account in Aristotle wrong, for the latter had the support of Androtion and Philochorus. Aristotle is hardly an independent authority in the matter, and may be only following Androtion; but the support of Philochorus perhaps weighs the balance against Thucydides.¹

¹ Schol. Ar. *Lys.* 421 and 609 follow Philochorus in this, indicating that his was the accepted version. But it may be noted that Harpocration, our authority for Androtion and Philochorus, misquotes Thucydides: ὁ δὲ Θ. τῶν ἑμνημόνευσε μόνων τῶν προβούλων, and has misled Sandys here.

Cary (pp. 10-11) also finds a difficulty in Thucydides' account of the meeting of the ecclesia at Colonus: What were the prytaneis doing to allow Peisander's resolutions? and how did the oligarchs obtain the necessary προβουλευμάτα from the democratic Boule? But the only προβούλευμα that was necessary was that a motion that any proposal could be made without fear of a γραφή παρανόμων should be allowed. After that was put and carried in legal form Peisander could propose what he liked. Thucydides' narrative is at any rate

35. 2 καὶ τοὺς τ' Ἐφιάλτου καὶ Ἀρχεστράτου νόμους τοὺς περὶ τῶν Ἀρεοπαγιτῶν καθέλλον ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου, καὶ τῶν Σόλωνος θεσμῶν ὅσοι διαμφισβητήσεις εἶχον καὶ τὸ κῆρος δ' ἦν ἐν τοῖς δικάσαις κατέλιπον.

What is the limit of improbability allowable in the *Constitution of Athens*? What kind of statement is so remarkable that it is more probably due to a copyist's error than to the author? We are very near the limit here. Who was Archestratus, and why is he suddenly mentioned here, as a well-known figure, though we have heard nothing of him before? If any one is to be mentioned besides Ephialtes it should obviously be Pericles (though he is omitted in 41. 2), for his separate attack on the Areopagus has already been told (27. 1). Probably, says Kenyon, 'he was one of the supporters of Ephialtes, and some of the laws curtailing the power of the Areopagus stood in his name.' Yet Aristotle has said nothing of him before, and no one else apparently ever mentioned him in this connexion. Moreover the position of τε (not Ἐφ. τε καὶ Ἀρχ.) suggests that his legislation was separate from Ephialtes', 'both Ephialtes' laws and Archestratus',¹ as Pericles' was according to the *Ath. Pol.* One cannot help suggesting that there is something seriously wrong with the text; that we should read Περικλέους here in place of Ἀρχεστράτου, and suppose that the latter's name occurred a little lower down, after ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου, in some such phrase as Ἀρ. γράψαντος τὴν γνώμην, he being a humble supporter of

consistent, for in the previous chapter he has described the state of terror to which the democrats had been reduced by the oligarchical clubs. Ar. 29. 4-5 in general agrees with Thuc. 67. 2-3, except that the latter includes the appointment of the 400 among the resolutions passed, and Aristotle does not. As Aristotle does not tell us how the 400 were in fact constituted (if with Cary we reject c. 31), he is presumably wrong here and Thucydides is right.

That the proposed constitutions of cc. 30 and 31 were amongst those discussed after the 400 were overthrown during the brief rule of the 5,000 (*cf.* Thuc. VIII. 97. 2), as Cary, following a suggestion of Beloch's, proposes, seems to me a very probable solution of this difficulty. See, however, Ehrenberg, *Hermes* 57, 1922, p. 621 ff.

¹ So 25. 4 δ τ' Ἐφ. καὶ Θεμιστοκλῆς, where it is quite unnecessary insert δ before Θ, as all editors do.

the thirty, introduced here as Aristion in 14. 1, Melobius in 29. 1, from the official record. An extravagant suggestion; but it may be right.

Editors seem to suppose that τε here connects the laws of Solon with those of Ephialtes, as equally removed from the Areopagus, and naturally find a difficulty, because Solon's laws were preserved not on the Areopagus, but in the Prytaneum; see Sandys, who to avoid this would strike out either ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου or τε. Neither is necessary. All that we need do is to punctuate as above, instead of with a comma after εἶχον and none after πάγου.

54. 7 κληροὶ δὲ καὶ ἑτέροις δέκα (ἱεροποιοῖς), τοὺς κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν καλουμένους, οἱ θυσίας τέ τινες θύουσι καὶ τὰς πεντετηρίδας ἀπάσας διοικοῦσιν πλὴν Παναθηναίων. εἰσὶ δὲ πεντετηρίδες μία μὲν ἡ εἰς Δῆλον . . . , δευτέρα δὲ Βραυρώνια, τρίτη δ' Ἡράκλεια, τετάρτη δ' Ἐλευσίνια, εἰ δὲ Παναθηναῖα· καὶ τούτων οὐδεμία ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ ἐγγίγνεται.

(For the last word the papyrus has γινε[ται], with εν written over it as a correction.)

There is a special reason for adopting Blass' reading ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ ἐνιαυτῷ γίγνεται, which has not so far been observed. The directors of these penteterides are yearly, not four-yearly officials like the ἀθλοθέται who managed the greater Panathenaea (60. 1). But if any two of the four festivals in their charge fell in the same year, then the ἱεροποιοί for at least one year of each quadriennium would have had no penteteris to manage. This is unlikely, even though they had some other duties, such as the management of the lesser, yearly Panathenaea in the first, second, and fourth years of an Olympiad (*C.I.A.* II., n. 163; Mommsen, *Feste*, p. 126).² Not only is it probable that every board of ἱεροποιοί had a penteteris to manage, but this would naturally have been expressed by Aristotle. Neither of the other interpretations of ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ ἐγγίγνεται ('in the same place' or 'in the same season of the year') is relevant; and ἐνιαυτῷ seems required to make the meaning clear.

² Mommsen agrees with Blass, and suggests that the order of the festivals in Aristotle is their order within an Olympiad, the Herakleia being probably held in the third, and the Eleusinia in the fourth year (p. 162. 2).

This emendation requires also (as Kaibel saw) that we should read *εἰσὶ δὲ <αῖ> πεντετηρίδες κ.τ.λ.*,¹ and that something should be done with *εἰ δὲ Παναθήναια*. Blass struck it out, and

¹ Best of all would be *εἰσὶ δὲ δ' αῖ π. αὐται* (combining suggestions of Kaibel and Harrison), but this involves too great a departure from the MSS.

here at least no one could say that such a note might not have 'crept in' from the margin. But we may suggest as well (*τὰ δὲ Παναθήναια <ὑπὸ τῶν ἀθλοθετῶν διοικεῖται>*). It would be clear enough, I think, that *τούτων* would then refer to *αῖ πεντετηρίδες* only.

A. W. GOMME.

ANAGRAMS.

SOME years ago, when cross-word puzzles were still regarded as a nursery game, the composition of anagrams was a favourite occupation for learned and unlearned alike. A Cambridge scholar produced a short poem which ended with *Skeat takes Kate's Keats away*; and the present writer, trying his hand on a Latin elegiac anagram, found about twenty-four permutations of the letters of the word *ingrate*, every one of which would make a Latin word or words. The Greek language is a good medium for anagram, owing to the richness of its vocabulary, the latitude given by dialectical variations, e.g. between *η* and *α*, and the variety of forms even in a single dialect: e.g. *ἄρα*, *ἄρ*, *ῥα*, *ῥ'* (with elision), are all one to Homer. It is therefore not too much to expect that any couplet of Greek verse, if dissected and carefully examined, may be found to contain the elements of other quite different words, and with exceptional luck or industry we may even compose other verses, whether in the same or different metre, dealing with any subject on earth rather than the original one, as Lucretius said prophetically:

omne genus motus et coetus experiendo
tandem conueniunt in tales disposituras.

Take, for instance, the end of the *Iliad*, not as we have it in our editions, but the alternative given by Sch. T., which has hitherto laboured under the unjust suspicion of spuriousness:

ὅς οὔ γ' ἀμφίεπον τάφον Ἑκτορος· ἦλθε δ' Ἄμα-
ζών
Ἄρης θυγάτηρ μεγαλήτορος ἀνδροφόνου—

hand it over to your son at a public school, and in the brief space of a French lesson he will produce words,

unintelligible to him, out of which you will build up the lines:

γάθες· ποῦ Κολοφῶν Σαλαμὶς Ῥόδος Ἄργος
Ἀθήνα;
ἦ ῥ' ἔτεδ' ἐν τῷ 'ζή'· τράγοφιν δ' ὀνομήτορα
φιμῶ,

which we shall easily paraphrase thus:

Hurrah! what about the old theories as to Homer's birthplace? Truly the principle 'live while you may' is a sound one, but I am trying to muzzle a Chimaera.

The dialectical variations in the first line can be paralleled from the vocabulary of other anagrams; the description of the Chimaera, 'a goat-snake mothered by an ass' (or is it 'mother of an ass?'), is comic rather than epic, and marks the transition from Homeric dignity to the taste of an age which produced the *Margites*.

Having speculated thus far we are ready to form an impartial judgment on *The Colophons of the Iliad and the Odyssey*.¹

The author of the *Homer of Aristotle* here follows the methods employed in that much criticised work—that is to say, he divides the last four lines of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* respectively into squares of letters, each square being an 'anagram unit.' The squares are normally of sixteen letters each, though some are defective, containing, for instance, fourteen, fifteen, or nine letters, and in one case a single letter only; but this is immaterial, as the units may overlap.

Each of the anagrams produced is in five iambic lines, in which the writer assures us that both the language and metre are absolutely normal. Of the

¹ By D. S. Margoliouth. Oxford: Basil Blackwood, 1925. 1s. net.

language it may be admitted that all the words can be found in dictionaries; if the metre is normal, we must revise our opinions about the iambic trimeter, though the more conservative among us will charitably assume that Homer, struggling with the technique of an unfamiliar metre, produced verses which,

to the Athenian taste, would have appeared crude, as the noble trimeters of Ennius and Accius did to Horace. But *quo, Musa, tendis?* Can it be, after all, that while we are laughing *γναθμοῖσι ἀλλοτρίοισι*, Dr. Margoliouth, like the slayer of Argos in the Homeric Hymn, is still speaking 'with a wink in his eye'?

J. F. DOBSON.

THE PROPOSED NEW DATE FOR IPSUS.

AMONG the cuneiform documents which have lately thrown light on Hellenistic history is a new Babylonian astronomical table bearing on the Ipsus campaign, which Father F. X. Kugler has recently published and commented on.¹ This table, which is S \dagger 1881 (76-II-17) in the British Museum, shows that, whereas Babylon was Seleucus's in Nisan 302, Antigonos was ruler of Babylon by 18 Duzu (6 Aug. 302 on Kugler's equations), and apparently was still ruler on 7 March 301. From these data Kugler deduces that Seleucus cannot have returned from India till after 7 March 301, that consequently his winter quarters in Cappadocia were not 302/1 but 301/0, and that therefore Ipsus cannot have been fought in 301, or earlier than spring 300; a date which, if well-founded, would create a widespread disturbance in the accepted chronology of the Successors, based on Diodorus (Hieronymus). I venture to interpret the new data very differently.

A passage in Arrian (*Ind.*, ch. 43, §§ 4, 5) I think gives the key. It states that Ptolemy I. sent to Seleucus Nicator, to Babylon, a message carried by men on swift camels through the desert across the 'isthmus' or neck of the Arabian peninsula; no date or context is given. The route taken from Egypt must have been via the oasis El Jauf; it appears that as far as Jauf this route must go through true desert, as Arrian describes it. The natural communication of Jauf seems to be with Transjordan; but

there appears to be no great difficulty in reaching the Euphrates from it, and the possibility of utilising this route has occasionally been discussed in modern times. I have failed to find any mention of this route in antiquity except Arrian's; but the preliminary question arises whether it can have formed a regular line of communication between Egypt and Babylon—that is, whether Ptolemy I. perhaps maintained a camel-post across Arabia. I think the idea must be negatived. That camels are not heard of in Egypt before the reign of Ptolemy II.² doubtless means little; but one would expect ordinary correspondence to follow the line of least resistance, the regular route by Damascus; for so far as is known the very speedy Persian system of couriers along the main roads was still maintained. But the real reason for supposing that the route via Jauf was not in regular use is that Arrian clearly seems to be recording an isolated and (to him or his source) somewhat extraordinary event. He says that no one has ever sailed round Arabia from Babylon to the Red Sea, unless some storm-driven crew; but as to the 'isthmus,' it has been crossed by fugitives from Cambyses' army and by 'the men sent by Ptolemy to Seleucus to Babylon'; these last, he adds, had to carry water on their camels, and travelled only by night as they could not bear the heat during the day. To say a desert has been crossed twice implies twice only. Presumably Ptolemy, in some emergency, got a native sheikh and his camels to take his messengers across; he was imitating Alexander, who, when he sent Polydamas on dromedaries across the

¹ *Sternkunde und Sterndienst in Babel*, B. II., T. II., Heft 2, 1924, pp. 438 ff.; and more fully in *Von Moses bis Paulus*, 1922, pp. 305 ff., which, though dated earlier, is referred to in the former work as forthcoming. I desire to thank Mr. Sidney Smith for calling my attention to the *Sternkunde*.

² See Wilcken in *Archiv für Papyrusforschung*, VII., 1924, p. 82.

Persian desert with the order to kill Parmenion,¹ must have engaged natives and their animals to take him.

One word here on Arrian's source. Nearchus' narrative ends with ch. 42, and in ch. 43, §§ 1-9, Arrian is putting together various material on the possibility of circumnavigating Arabia, as Alexander had planned to do. In § 2 the words *εἵνεκα τοῦ σύρρουν εἶναι τὴν ἕξω θάλασσαν* point clearly to Eratosthenes, whom (ch. 3, § 1) he calls *πιστότερος ἄλλου*. Then comes the Ptolemy story. § 6 is his own deduction, that the southward part of the Arabian coast of the Persian Gulf is uninhabitable. § 7 is the ship sent from the gulf of Heroopolis which reached Yemen; Theophrastus gives it more fully (*Hist. Plant.* 9, 4), doubtless ultimately from the captain's report; it was probably dispatched by Alexander (Strabo 16, 768). §§ 8 and 9 summarise Arrian *Anab.* 7, 20, 3-8, *i.e.* the reports of the ship-captains Archias and Hiero as given by Aristobulus. What Arrian is using in ch. 43, §§ 1-9, is then all good fourth or third century material; and there can be little doubt that, wherever he got his curious story about the remote Cambyses, his Ptolemy story in §§ 4 and 5 is also good material, and doubtless comes from Hieronymus, who was his main authority for his history of the Successors. The story may therefore be accepted as fact.

If then Ptolemy, who must of course often have communicated with Babylon, once and once only sent a message thither across the Arabian desert, the natural explanation seems to me to be, that the Damascus road with its couriers was closed to him, *i.e.* occupied by an enemy. As, having regard to Seleucus' movements, this enemy could only be Antigonus I., the incident cannot belong either after Ipsus (when moreover Seleucus was not at Babylon), or before the outbreak of Antigonus' first war with the coalition in spring 315. But from 316 to 312 Seleucus was in Egypt; peace was made early in 311; a good deal of Seleucus' time after 311 was spent in the far east. The incident must therefore belong to the second

war in which Antigonus and Ptolemy were enemies, 306 to 301; and this places it. For when late in 303 Cassander, Lysimachus, Ptolemy, and Seleucus formed their league to destroy Antigonus, how did the other kings communicate with Seleucus, seeing that Antigonus held every regular route between west and east? No historian has noticed this difficulty. Arrian here shows that it was done by Ptolemy sending messengers across Arabia. Seleucus therefore was back in Babylon from India by winter 303/2, or early spring 302 at latest; and therewith Kugler's deduction falls to the ground.

The passage from Malalas (Migne, *Patr. Gr.* 97 p. 111) which Kugler uses to confirm his deduction, and which says that Seleucus founded Antioch immediately (*εὐθέως*) after his victory, does not help; for even if Malalas be right in saying Antioch was founded in May 300, as is likely enough, this is quite consistent with Ipsus in summer 301, as has generally been seen; one cannot press words like *εὐθέως* in a late writer, and in fact there was a great deal done in between; *e.g.* Antigonus' kingdom had first to be divided up, a matter in which Cassander, who at the time was in Macedonia, played a leading part.

But though Kugler's date must be rejected, one owes him many thanks for publishing a document which throws light on the Ipsus campaign, unfortunately lost in Diodorus. What happened seems clear. Seleucus got Ptolemy's message at Babylon in winter 303/2 or early in 302, and in late spring or early summer 302 started westward. At this time some of Antigonus' troops were with Demetrius in Thessaly, and Antigonus with his main army was moving on Asia Minor in an attempt to crush Lysimachus. He could not send a sufficient force to hold Seleucus also; he understood first principles, and needed his strength to try and dispose of Lysimachus before Seleucus could join him. But, after Seleucus started, he sent a small column to occupy Babylon (which was unwallled), on the chance of making Seleucus turn back; this column, whether or no it took the palace fortress, had occupied Babylon

¹ Arr. *Anab.* 3, 26, 3; Strabo 15, 724.

by 6 August 302, and probably held it till Ipsus. For Seleucus, who also understood first principles, did not turn back; he knew that the way to recover

Babylon was to join Lysimachus and defeat Antigonos' main army. The new document really confirms the accepted dating of Ipsus in 301.

W. W. TARN.

VERGIL'S FIRST *ECLOGUE* AND THE MIGRATION TO AFRICA.

THOUGH Vergil's First *Eclogue* begins with a note of gratitude, its real purpose soon becomes apparent as a protest against the senseless wars that resulted in cruel evictions and the migration of Italy's innocent peasantry to Africa and the other provinces.¹ Since land was being expropriated for 170,000 soldiers, it is only likely that fully as large a number of peasants were evicted, and the emigration which Vergil mentions must have been a real fact. Mr. Heitland has recently² questioned the supposed migration to Africa without considering all the inscriptional evidence. Africa was after all the most inviting of Rome's provinces for prospective settlers. Marian, Gracchan, and Julian colonists were already prospering there, the province was gaining a reputation for productivity,³ Sallust had recently called attention to its wealth by carrying home immense treasures thence, Sittius had established himself as a royal sheikh at Cirta, and there were still vacant and public lands to be had. But quite apart from probabilities, the inscriptions of the province of Africa picture a state of things that can be adequately explained only by supposing that Vergil's words are to be taken seriously, and that very many Romans migrated to Africa in the decade or two following Philippi.

Before Caesar's day there was no officially organised colony in Africa, though a few thousand Gracchan and Marian followers had been settled *viritim* west of Carthage. Caesar gave colonial status to Cirta, but the soldiers of the adventurer Sittius were largely native Africans. Caesar also gave orders to rebuild Carthage and to send a colony there, but, as coins and the religious

cults prove, a large part of the new population of Carthage consisted of returning natives. Augustus sent veterans to Uthina and Thuburbo, and probably to Sicca and Maxula. All four of these places are on Pliny's list (V. 22, 24, 29) of colonies, and were therefore on the Augustan list which Pliny used. We have inscriptions from the three former places which prove them Augustan foundations. An inscription of the Roman Forum shows that some soldiers of the thirteenth legion were settled in Uthina,⁴ and a recent African fragment reveals that members of the eighth legion were sent to Thuburbo.⁵ These colonies probably belong to the settlements of 29 and 14 B.C.

Now this is all the official colonisation in Africa of which we hear, and yet Pliny's list (V. 30), the source of which is some official document of Agrippa's time, gives fifteen towns as *oppida civium Romanorum*. Most of these towns had existed long before the Romans came and bear African names. Of the fifteen Utica alone seems to have been granted the rights of citizenship. Presumably the rest, or most of the rest, were *oppida c. R.* by virtue of a remarkable influx of Roman citizens who had become the predominant element in the population, and were administering the towns, or at least their portion of each town, on Roman formulae.⁶

¹ *C.I.L.* VIII., p. 2427, and Dessau, *I.L.S.* 6784; cf. *C.I.L.* VII. 885 and *L'Année Épig.*, 1909, No. 158.

² *C. R. Acad. Ins.*, 1913, p. 436; *Année Ép.*, 1915, No. 37. Others were settled in Berytus, in Forum Julii, and at Fanum Fortunae. For Sicca, see *C.I.L.* VIII. 27568: *Divo Augusto conditori Siccenses*.

³ Not all of the fifteen are explained by recent immigration. Utica had been granted *civitas*; Thigiba, Uchi Majus, and Vaga were in the region where Marius had distributed lands to soldiers, and we may presume that the presence of these colonists had long attracted Roman migrants to these towns. Simitthu, on the other hand, was an old Punic

¹ 'At nos hinc alii sitientis ibimus Afros' (l. 64).

² *J.R.S.*, 1918, 42; *Agricola*, p. 348.

³ Nepos, *Atticus* 12; Cic. *Pro Cael.* 30; Horace, *C. I. l.* 10 and III. 16.

Furthermore, there is a second class of cities which also indicates a considerable influx of Romans in the Augustan period. There are five towns which later assume the name of *Colonia Iulia*, though they were not officially so called in the days of Augustus. These are Curubis and Neapolis, which were *oppida libera* in Augustus' day (Pliny V. 24), Hippo Diarrhytus (Bizerta, called *civ. lib.* on Augustan coins), Assuras (called *oppidum civ. Rom.* in Pliny), and Carpis (*oppidum*, Pliny V. 24). Since these towns did not actually acquire true colonial status till the second century, there has been some question as to why they then assumed the name *Iulia*. As Dessau has said,¹ an inscription of Bizerta (*C.I.L. VIII. 25417*) shows that a similar claim was made in the early Empire in two of the towns. In this inscription the people of Carpis, or a part of Carpis, call

town that had grown up near the famous Numidian marble quarry. After the fall of Carthage the quarry was little used until Augustan architects began to call for the marble again, and it was doubtless these quarries which attracted enough Romans to make the town predominantly one of citizens. Of the others we know very little.

¹ *Klio*, 1908, 457 f.

themselves *Coloni Col. Iuliae Carpitanae*, and they address the people of *Col. Iuliae Hipp. Diarrh. as consanguinei*. He believes that both cities had double administration, and that the *coloni* of these cities were settled by Julius Caesar. The double administration is probable, but that Augustus should have demoted Julian colonies formally planted is highly improbable.² The explanation seems to be that many Roman immigrants had come into these towns; that Augustus, perhaps after Agrippa's survey had been made, gave such groups of immigrants a separate pagan administration, so that they were inclined to assume by a slight extension of the term the position of Augustan *coloni*; and that, finally, when their towns received colonial status they adopted the name *Iulia*.

At any rate, we have abundant evidence in the lines of Vergil and in the strong element of Romans within these two classes of old Punic towns for the assumption of a large migration of Romans to Africa in the early Augustan period.

TENNEY FRANK.

² The assumptions of Kornemann (*Philologus*, 1901, p. 413) are based upon incomplete data.

NOTES ON HORACE.

I.—*Odes* III. x. AND xxviii.

THE former ode is usually given a pretty frigid reception by editors. Yet it is (in its class) an excellent piece of work and can teach the elegiac specialists a few lessons.

Throughout there runs the customary strain: 'Pity, not Pride.' Intermingled are two motives, the one assisting the poet's amorous enterprise by the suggestion of what may be called the Possibilities of the Situation, the other relieving the poet's injured feelings by the expression of his displeasure in terms of insult.

It is the former motive which raises the piece above the level of most compositions of the kind.

Thus, in vv. 1-2 *si biberes . . . saeво nupta uiro* implies, if the lady has the wit to draw the inference, 'Your

husband is civilised and unlikely to be severe towards your infidelities.'

In v. 11 *Penelope* implies, 'Your husband is not at home and all will be safe'—since for a wife to be even a faithless *Penelope* the first condition is the absence of her *Odysseus*.

In vv. 15-16, *nec uir . . . curuat* suggests, 'Your husband is not a husband when he is at home.'

All this persuasion is delicately, deftly, and wittily introduced.

The insult is more obvious, as it is more conventional; but all is directed against mental or moral, not physical, shortcomings. The lady is disreputable, disloyal, heartless. And so her vanity can be comfortable.

But though clever this ode cannot escape a charge of coarseness, because it is so frank.

The same cannot be said of *Odes* III.

xxviii., where we have a more 'polite' and subtle way of conveying a similar invitation to a lady.

There Horace and his Lyde will drink and sing, manly and feminine, in turn. Then the crowning lay will be of Venus, sung together: until the 'politeness' just avoids breaking down with *merita nox quoque nenia*. Trivial as these neglected odes may be in some respects, they may nevertheless serve a useful purpose in guiding to a right estimate of contemporary masters of elegiac verse.

II.—Odes III. xxvi.

Is it possible that editors misunderstand the whole situation when they interpret the last stanza as a (more or less) comic surprise volte-face on Horace's part—Horace will not and yet he will? Thus, Kiessling (R. Heinze): 'vergebens hat der Dichter um Chloe geworben' usw.

The abruptness, almost intolerable, involved in this interpretation may be

avoided, if we suppose that Horace has come to terms with Chloe and has agreed to abandon promiscuous amours.

Away from the literary conventions of chivalry, it is not at all strange that the bachelor who is about to contract an alliance of some duration should regard the happy occasion as the close of his services to Venus and as the proper time to dedicate his arms to that goddess.

Horace's arms are all such as the bachelor needs for his adventurous campaigns.

He gives up the weapons of violence because as a lover protesting fidelity he must, and in the surrender he expresses his fidelity in poetic fashion.

But with an old campaigner's caution he himself wants a guarantee. If Chloe, in spite of her vows, prove troublesome or fickle, Venus is to avenge her disarmed veteran. *Semel arrogantem=si semel arrogabit*. There is some sense in *semel* so understood.

D. L. DREW.

THE PROEM OF LUCAN.

THAT the blood spent in civil war might have been more usefully employed in the conquest of Rome's enemies is a thought which Lucan did not originate: Horace had employed it in the seventh *Epode*, where he speaks of Carthage and of the Britons, the conquest of whom was at the time repeatedly discussed. Lucan says that the price of civil war would have secured East, West, North, and South (15-18):

unde uenit Titan et nox ubi sidera condit
quaue dies medius flagrantibus aestuat horis
et qua bruma rigens ac nescia uere remitti
astringit Scythico glaciale frigore pontum.

The next couplet deserves special attention:

sub iuga iam Seres, iam barbarus isset Araxes
et gens siqua iacet nascenti conscia Nilo.

At first sight the Seres, the Araxes, and the dwellers by the sources of the Nile may well seem to have been selected as types of distant peoples: we might compare Horace, *Odes* III. 29, 25.

tu ciuitatem quis deceat status
curas et urbi sollicitus times
quid Seres et regnata Cyro
Bactra parent Tanaisque discors,

or I. 29, 7, *puer . . . doctus sagittas tendere Sericas arcu paterno*. If, however, we remember that Nero sent a detachment of praetorians to explore the sources of the Nile, that Lucan's uncle Seneca, from whom Lucan drew not a little of his information, speaks of the expedition (*Nat. quaest.* VI. 8. 3), and that there is reason to date its return in the summer of A.D. 63, we shall be disposed to attach more meaning to line 20. Nero in 66 probably intended to make an expedition against the Axumite kings of Abyssinia;¹ it is reasonable to assume that this early movement was in the nature of a reconnaissance, and that it was known or believed at Rome to be such. If we turn back to line 19, the name *Araxes* may recall to us Corbulo's brilliant campaigns in Armenia, in the course of which he burnt Artaxata on the Araxes in 58, and established Rome's authority in that country.²

¹ W. Schur, *Die Orientpolitik des Kaisers Nero* (*Klio, Beiheft* XV., 1923), 42 f., for the date 93, 99 ff., 112 for the later plan.

² Cf. Stein, *Pauly-Wissowa, Suppl.* III. 405 f.

Even the Seres are relevant, if we accept an attractive hypothesis recently maintained by Schur, that Nero's projected expedition to the Caspian Gates aimed at securing the great Northern route for trade between the West and China.¹ We do not hear of this expedition before 66, but it may well have been contemplated earlier, as Schur argues,² and a project to secure the trade route to China might be magnified into an attempt to reduce that country to submission.

In the light of these facts Lucan's words seem to come into the correct historical perspective. Written and recited before his breach with Nero, they mean, in effect, 'Rome's power, rightly used, might have attained earlier what it attains or is about to attain under the beneficent rule of Nero.' It is probably because Lucan is thinking of Nero that he ignores the fact of Armenia's submission to Pompey. As here Lucan reflects Imperial plans and aspirations, so later in his apotheosis of Nero (l. 45 ff.) does he reproduce ideas current at the time, while adapting a Virgilian model, the beginning of the first *Georgic*. Nero has two choices offered, *sceptra tenere*, to be Jupiter, or to mount the car of Phoebus and be the

Sun. Now as Ζεύς Ἐλευθέριος he was hailed by the grateful Greeks in 67. He may well have been so regarded even earlier, as were Theophanes of Mytilene and Augustus. Calpurnius Siculus, *Ecl.* 4. 142, holds that he may be Jupiter in disguise, and coins of Dioshieron in Lydia have as their obverse-type busts of Nero and Zeus, with the inscription ΖΕΥΣ ΝΕΡΩΝ ΚΑΙΣΑΡ.³ As νέος ἥλιος Nero received homage at most times: that he liked the part is shown by the fact that he set up a colossus of the Sun with his own features in front of the Golden House.⁴ We must recognise in Lucan what Weinreich has proved for the *Apocolocyntosis* of Seneca, that in what seems to us extravagant flattery he is speaking the conventional language of the age, and expressing notions widely held.⁵

A. D. Nock.

³ Cf. Mattingly, *J.R.S.* X. 38, *B.M.C. Rom. Emp.* I. clxxxiv.: for Theophanes see Dittenberger *Sylloge* 753; for the coin of Dioshieron, *B.M.C. Lydia*, 75. 7 (Riewald, *Diss. phil. Hal.* XX. 3. 301, doubts whether identification is here implied, yet Nero is at least in some sort a νέος Ζεύς).

⁴ Mattingly, *B.M.C. Rom. Emp.* I. clxxiii. f.; cf. *J.R.S.* XIII. 105 f. The relevance of this to the words of Lucan was seen by L. Paul, *Fleckeisens Jahrbücher*, CXLIX. (1894), 409 ff.

⁵ *Senecas Apocolocyntosis* (1923), 38 ff. An inscription at Alabanda in honour of Augustus, Ἀπόλλωνος Ἐλευθερίου Σεβαστοῦ, may perhaps imply that he is identified with Apollo and with Zeus Eleutherios (as Dittenberger urges, *Or. graeci inscr. sel.* 457 n. 1).

¹ *Op. cit.* 63 ff. On the trade route see M. P. Charlesworth, *Trade Routes of the Roman Empire*, 98 ff.

² *Klio* XX. (= *N.F.* II.), 215 ff.

LEXICAL NOTES.

ἐξαιρέτα· ἀναλώματα.

ON a *bomos* at Laodicea Combusta of the third century A.D., published by Heberdey and Wilhelm, *Reisen in Kilikien*, p. 161, no. 268, it is said that the dedicators ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων ἐξερτίων ἐστῆσαν μνήμης χάριν. That ἐξ(αι)ρέτα in this text means simply ἀναλώματα is shown by another third-century inscription of the same city, published in *Ath. Mitt.*, 1888, p. 249, no. 44, which should read (Ramsay and Calder, 1911; Calder, 1925): Ἀδρ. Γάιος καὶ Διομήδης καὶ Μαρίων Μείρων πατρὶ καὶ μητρὶ Παύλῳ ἀνέστησαν μνήμης χάριν. τὰδε θάλασιν τῷ Μαρρίωνι τὰ ἐξέρετα· ἐποίησε τὸν βωμόν. The three brothers joined in the dedication; Marion paid the bill.

ἐπιψηφίζεῖν· ἐπισφραγίζειν.

In the Resolution of the Stage Guild now lying in the Augusteum at Angora, published by D'Orbeliani in *J.H.S.*, 1924, pp. 35 f. (cf. W. H. Buckler, *ibid.*, pp. 158 ff.), the reading

ἐπεψηφισεν (l. 17) is certain (Calder, Cox, Cullen, 1925). In the sense of ἐπισφραγίζειν, which it must bear here, ἐπιψηφίζειν appears to be new.

ἔχειν πρὸς.

ON the *locus classicus* for this phrase, II. *Cor.* 5, 12, Moulton and Milligan are silent. For its Pauline and literary sense 'have wherewith to answer,' see the commentators *ad loc.*, and Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II., p. 172, note 1. The expression is used in a similar but distinct sense in Christian inscriptions of the later third and fourth centuries, where ἔχει or ἔξει πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, used of the violator of the grave, corresponds exactly to the better-known formulae δώσει λόγον τῷ Θεῷ and ἔσται αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν. The form ἔσται πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, which occurs rarely, is probably an illiterate variant of the latter phrase. See *J.R.S.*, 1924, pp. 37, 85-88.

ἰδία μοῖρα, a natural death.

In Ramsay's *Cities and Bishoprics*, etc., p. 328, no. 133, we read: Ἀδρ. Εἰρηναῖος ἐιστρατιώτης

ἰστρατεύσας ἐνδόξως, πολλοὺς ὤλεσεν στὰς¹ διὰ χειρῶν, ἐτελεύτησεν ἐν Λυκίᾳ Λιμύροις εἰδὼς θανάτῳ. The best comment on this text is that publish d in the same work, p. 339, no. 187: 'Ἐρμῆς Δουκίου Γῆ' Ἀλόπου γυναικὶ καὶ Ἐρμῇ ὑφ' ἐπιβολῆς ἀνέστησε μνήμης χάριν' ἐπὶ μὲν ἰδίᾳ μοίρῃ, ὠφίλει, ἐπὶ δὲ χειρ[σ]ι δολοποιῶν, 'Ἡλίο, βλέπε (I follow the copyist's copy; on the concluding invocation, see now Cumont in *Atti d. Pont. Accad. Rom. di Arch.*, Ser. III.; *Memorie* I. 1, pp. 65 ff.). The same expression occurs in *Orac. Sibyll.* XII. 175: αὐτὸς δ' αὖ πέσεται, μοίρῃ ἰδίᾳ καταλόσας, with which compare *Eur. Med.* 146, θανάτῳ καταλοισάμεν. Cf. *ἰδιοθανεῖν*, *ἰδιοθανατεῖν*, *ἰδιοθάναντος*, wrongly explained in L.S. (8th edn.), and contrast *βαιοθανατεῖν*, *ibid.*, and *βιοθάναντος* in Cagnat, *I.G.R.P.* III., p. 518, no. 1529.

W. M. CALDER.

SENECA, PHAEDRA, 85-88.

O magna uasti Creta dominatrix freti
cuius per omne litus innumerae rates
†tenuere pontum quicquid Assyria tenus
tellure Nereus peruius rostris secat . . .

peruium A. The latest editor, Dr. Herrman (Budé series), reads:

tellure Nerea peruium rostris secas,

which, though better than Leo's and Richter's attempts, still leaves something to desire in point of neatness, for it is odd to say that *Crete* 'cleaves with the beak those waters which her ships occupy.' I suggest that the foundation of criticism in this passage is to recognise that *TENVERE* } is an evident dittograph. We then ask, which of these is genuine? Answer: *tellure*, since the phrase *Assyria tenus tellure* is a solid phrase, whereas *tenuere* is de trop. Why de trop? Because the phrase *innumerae*

rates . . . *rostris secant* (for MSS. *secat*) makes another verb needless. Remains the problem how to recover the defining phrase.

1. What word has *tenuere* extruded? The word that is required to express extent, *patentem*. We now have *cuius innumerae rates pontum patentem* . . . , *rostris secant*.

2. The next question is, *quid patet pontus*? And the answer *pontum patentem quicquid Assyria tenus tellure Nereos peruium*, 'All the navigable seas between us and Syria.'

If anybody be a stickler for E against A in details, it would perhaps not be indefensible to construe *quicquid peruius* (est) *Nereus* as = *quaqua peruius est Nereus*; but it would be odd, and less probable; for faults of copyists which destroy a genuine word nearly always entail minor interpolations accommodating the ruins to the intrusive matter.

J. S. PHILLIMORE.

MARTIAL XII 59 9.

(See Vol. XXXIX pp. 200 f.)

I CAN now provide *dexiocholus* with a stouter defence than the imprudent improvisation of Mr Heraeus. Men lame of the right leg were to be dreaded because it was unlucky to meet them. *Lucian pseudol.* 17 ἡμεῖς δὲ καὶ τοὺς χαλοὺς τῷ δεξιῷ ἐκτρεπόμεθα, καὶ μάλιστα εἰ ἔσθην ἰδοίμεν αὐτοὺς, *Pliny n. h.* XXVIII 35 'despuimus comitiales morbos . . . simili modo et fascinationes repercutimus dextraeque clauditis occursum,' wrongly explained in *thes. ling. Lat.* III p. 1306 17 and V p. 922 9.

The metre and the missing vocative, about which I wrote in *C.Q.* XIII p. 79, may now be restored thus:

hinc < Rex, > dexiocholus, inde lippus.

Cicero's correspondent in *fam.* XIII 52 is addressed solely by this cognomen, 'Cicero Regi s.', 'faciatur, mi Rex, ut intellegat.'

A. E. HOUSMAN.

REVIEWS

OUR DEBT TO GREEK MYTHOLOGY.

Our Debt to Greece and Rome: Mythology.

By JANE ELLEN HARRISON. London: George Harrap and Co., Ltd.

If ever Miss Harrison was accused by the more straitlaced of our Hellenists of wandering too far afield in the ways of anthropology, of taking excessive interest in the undoubtedly intriguing doings of peoples with dusky faces and woolly heads, she may now be acquitted without a stain upon her character. For the paths of anthropology have only led her back again, with a conviction worth far more than if she had

never strayed — that whatever of savagery may have lingered round the Greek even at his highest development, the really interesting thing about him is not his savagery but his Hellenism. This little American series has given her the opportunity to put her convictions in a nutshell, and to state what she regards as the significance of that mythology which the Greeks fashioned out of the simplicities of primitive thought in which, like other members of the human family, they had their beginnings. Their achievement has

¹ The editor alters to ὤλεσε [λι]στὰς.

never had better expression. The Greeks 'started with the same religious material as other races, with fear of the unseen, with fetish worship, with unsatisfied desire, and out of this vague and crude material they fashioned the Immortals.' 'We owe to Greek mythology the heritage of a matchless imagery, which has haunted the minds of poets and artists down to the present day; and, second, . . . the release of the human spirit, in part at least, from the baneful obsession of fear.'

The book is far from being a mere essay on the title. Miss Harrison's method here is to take in turn each of the more interesting and perplexing figures of Greek mythology, and to trace the successive stages of development from vague and primitive powers to the clearly defined, humanised gods familiar in poetry and myth. Hermes, with his perplexing attributes of Herm-pillar, caduceus, commerce, and wayfaring is pulled to pieces, till we see clearly how these diffused ideas were welded somehow into an individual personality. So with Poseidon—more bewildering still—we see how the bull-god of an agricultural people, who were also seafaring, picked up the horse-god of a sea-going race who had settled down to horse-rearing in Libya. Her warning that Poseidon was always a god of the crafts of the

sea, and not of the element itself, is useful in a popular book as a corrective of a misconception that is too common in connexion with Greek mythology. The movements of peoples, evidenced by excavations, are emphasised to explain the distribution of cults, though it is not necessary to accept all Miss Harrison's racial equations. The series of gods thus dealt with includes the Mountain Mother, Demeter and Kore, Artemis, Apollo, Dionysus, and culminates very effectively in Zeus, who, as the least primitive of the whole pantheon, the most god-like according to modern conceptions, gives the full measure of the Greek ascent from the primitive strata of thought in which they made their beginning.

If the book has a fault, it is in being better suited to readers familiar with *Prolegomena* and *Themis*, and with Miss Harrison's somewhat elliptic style, which is inclined to flatter the knowledge of her readers; and she is still wilfully incapable of resisting the latest fad and fangle of fashionable psychology. All who have cared for her work or had the privilege of her teaching will welcome this further word from her in her old field of mythological study, and will find themselves pleasurably reminded, not only of their debt to Greece, but of their debt to Jane Ellen Harrison.

DOROTHY BROOKE.

THE SONGS OF SAPPHO.

The Songs of Sappho. By MARION MILLS MILLER, Litt.D., and DAVID M. ROBINSON, Ph.D., LL.D., Litt.D. Pp. xiv + 436. Lexington, Kentucky: The Maxwellton Company. Price not stated. \$1.00

DR. ROBINSON'S work on *Sappho and her Influence* was reviewed in these columns earlier (C.R. XXXIX. p. 194). To the present volume he contributes (a) a 'critical memoir,' which seems to be abridged from his larger work (it is at any rate of the same character), (b) an essay on the recovery and restoration of the Egyptian relics, of about the scope and quality of an average well-informed Extension Lecture, and (c) a revised text of the Greek remains of Sappho, to which he contributes practi-

cally nothing of his own, with a few notes and a prose translation of each. I have not detected any omissions in his research.

Dr. Miller's contribution, consisting of translations 'into rimed verse' is more original. He defends his attempt to produce rhyming English Sapphics, and quotes the statement of Mr. Ernest Govett that 'his' (Dr. Miller's) 'translation of this hymn' (to Aphrodite) 'is unquestionably the best in our language.' A specimen will illustrate the nature of the experiment:

Quickly thou camest; and, Blessèd One, with
smiling
Countenance immortal my heavy heart be-
guiling,
Askest the cause of my pitiful condition—
Why my petition:

What most I craved in brain-bewildered
yearning;
Whom would I win, so winsome in her spurning;
'Who is she, Sappho, evilly requiting
Fond love with slighting?'

In general Dr. Miller seems to me to be more successful in native English metres; but his renderings are apt to exaggerate the humour with which he so emphatically credits the poetess. He takes liberties, too, and will construct

you a complete poem out of three or four brief fragments; but he is not alone in overlooking the fact that Sappho gained her reputation by writing what others could not write.

On the whole this is a book for dilet-tanti. Indeed, what we have before us is a limited edition, signed by the authors—an attractive volume, save that one sheet came unsewn after a couple of hours' handling.

GILBERT A. DAVIES.

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE OLD COMEDY.

Chronologie der altattischen Komödie.

Von PAUL GEISLER. Pp. 80. Berlin: Weidmann, 1925. 4 Marks.

THE chronology of the Old Attic Comedy has been the subject of many discussions in recent years, and the work of Wilhelm, Capps, Oellacher, Jachmann, and others has added greatly to our knowledge. What was above all wanted was a short and business-like summary of the ascertained results and the points still in dispute, with the arguments clearly and succinctly given; and this is provided by the present book. It is, however, more than a summary, and contains more original work than the author's modest account of himself would suggest. His judgment throughout is sound and clear, and many of his own suggestions are convincing.

The book opens with a discussion of the vexed question whether the lists of Comic victors give the names of the composers of the victorious plays or of the διδάσκαλοι; on this point he agrees with Kaibel and Capps, who think that the names are those of the poets

throughout, as against Wilhelm, Wilamowitz and Jachmann. This point settled, the testimony of the inscriptions is summarised and discussed; here Geissler accepts Dittmer's view as regards the number of lines in the important Roman inscriptions (I.G. xiv., 1097, 1098), though differing from him as to some of his restorations. After a few paragraphs on the measures supposed to have restricted the freedom of the poets, and upon the number of plays presented by each poet for competition, the book gives a chronological survey of the plays of the Old Comedy, stating the evidence for each play briefly, but with adequate references to other discussions. For convenience, the discussion is divided into five periods—before 430 B.C., 430-421, 421-411, 411-400, and after 400. It is impossible in a short review to follow it in detail; it must suffice to say that the work is very well done, and the book will be indispensable for any thorough study of the Old Comedy.

A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE.

THE INFLUENCE OF ARISTOPHANES.

Aristophanes: His Plays and His Influence. By LOUIS E. LORD, Professor of Latin, Oberlin College. (Our Debt to Greece and Rome.) Pp. xi + 181. London: G. G. Harrap and Co., Ltd., 1925. 5s. net.

THIS book is one of a series which contains both good and bad volumes, and should stand fairly high in the list. When the limited space is considered, the work is well done, and the book as

a whole is readable. The first chapter deals briefly with the origin and general characteristics of Greek comedy and gives a short description of the theatre. The account of the origin contains a few doubtful statements—e.g. (on p. 6) that the Dorian music-like farces (including apparently the works of Epicharmus and Sophron) 'were intimately familiar and the jests were made almost exclusively at the expense

of persons who were in the audience.' This seems to be the exact opposite of the truth. Nor does it appear to be true (p. 7) that the Athenians denied the claim of the Megareans to have originated comedy with a 'virulent vigor'; they once or twice refer to Megarean comedy with contempt, but that is another thing. It may be doubted whether the men 'riding on ostriches or dolphins' (p. 14) really represent comic choruses. But these are small matters, belonging, in any case, to a region in which nearly everything is uncertain. Chapter II. gives a sketch of the Athens of Aristophanes which is substantially sound, though a fastidious reader may revolt against such sentences as that which states that 'the jazz jaundice had attacked music and was casting a pale and sickly hue over the countenance of the good old battle-hymns.' The account of Aristophanes' plays in Chapter III. succeeds in the really difficult task

of summarising these in a readable manner, and without neglect of essentials, in 40 small pages. Then the writer passes to the poet's influence, and his treatment of the period from the fifth century down to Lucian is quite satisfactory. The last three chapters, dealing with the influence of Aristophanes on German, French, and English writers respectively, are less attractive, being rather sketchy and disconnected. This is not surprising in view of the amount of ground to be covered; but a less strictly chronological and geographical arrangement might have permitted a more interesting account of the different kinds of influence which the poet has had. For scholars who desire a full treatment of the subject, the excellent work of Süss, *Aristophanes und die Nachwelt*, will still be indispensable; but Professor Lord's little book may be commended as giving at least an accurate history in outline.

A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE.

OUR DEBT TO ARISTOTLE.

Our Debt to Greece and Rome: Aristotelianism. By JOHN LEOFRIC STOCKS. Pp. vii + 165. London: G. G. Harrap and Co., Ltd., 1925. 5s. net.

PROFESSOR STOCKS'S volume is a very welcome addition to the series of which it forms part. He has judged wisely in making it an exposition of Aristotle's main thought rather than an essay on the Aristotelian tradition. More than half of the book is covered by the chapter on *Aristotle's World*, that is on the general theory of God, Man, and Nature which runs through the Aristotelian corpus. A brief *Prologue* and *Epilogue* deal with the few known facts about the philosopher's life and his inheritance from Socrates and Plato, and with the subsequent fortunes of his doctrine. The central chapter forms a piece of clear and accurate exposition in singularly simple language, reasonably exhaustive and eminently balanced. It can be heartily recommended both to the intelligent reader who wants an accurate statement of Aristotle's main positions and to the intending special student looking for a first introduction to his fuller studies. Mr. Stocks quite

properly avoids the numerous unsolved problems which confront us when we go beyond Aristotle's express words and ask how much more he ought to have said if he meant to remove all our perplexities. In view of the gravity of some of these problems, I feel that a little too much is made of the 'consistency' of the philosopher. I am sure that Mr. Stocks himself is far too well read in Aristotelianism not to know how very difficult it is to make Aristotle consistent with himself on most of the ultimate issues without suppressing half of his own utterances. Perhaps it would be a higher compliment, and nearer the truth, to say that Aristotle's mind never ceased growing and, for that reason, never reached final consistency with itself. The accuracy of Mr. Stocks's account of the philosopher's definitely formulated positions is such that almost the one definite slip I observe is the inclusion of envy in a list of 'emotions' which are 'neither good nor bad' (p. 90), though the *Ethics* expressly says that *φθόνος* is 'always in an excess,' and therefore always vicious.

One or two of the statements in the

generally judicious *Prologue* strike me as unfortunate. It is not *known* that the Academy was founded in the precise year 387 B.C., nor is it the 'traditional' view (p. 26) that the autobiographical section of the *Phaedo* is a history of Plato's own mind. This is a modern and very absurd speculation. It is quite inconceivable that at the end of the fifth century Plato should have puzzled over the question whether the earth was 'round or flat.' Even those who can believe that Plato constructed a wholly fictitious spiritual history for his hero ought not to be able to believe *this*. How can Mr. Stocks say (p. 27) that in the *Phaedo* 'Socrates' narrative places the good or final cause definitely but politely in the second place'? Or again that by the 'original' doctrine about Forms Aristotle means that held in the Academy when he himself joined it (p. 31)? If Platonism had been revolutionised within Aristotle's own personal memory, how came he never to mention the fact?

I am sorry to learn from the *Epilogue*

that Mr. Stocks discredits Strabo's account of the long concealment of Aristotle's manuscripts. I believe that if he had been able to ponder longer over the problems raised in Jaeger's *Aristoteles* he would have seen that some such loss and rediscovery is absolutely necessary to account for the curious fate of the once admired Aristotelian dialogues; they were killed by the re-appearance of *our* Aristotle. The brief account of mediaeval Aristotelianism does not get the perspective quite right, and it is an error of fact to suggest that William of Moerbeke was *beginning* to make his translations of Aristotle in 1273. This would have effectually prevented St. Thomas, who died in the following year, from profiting by his friend's industry. It is a pity that the *Bibliography* does not mention at least one work dealing with the history of Aristotelianism in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, e.g. Gilson's *La Philosophie au Moyen Age* or Baeumker's contribution to the history of Philosophy contained in *Die Kultur der Gegenwart*.

A. E. TAYLOR.

TWO ANTHOLOGIES OF GREEK.

The Pageant of Greece. Edited by R. W. LIVINGSTONE. Pp. xii + 436. Oxford: Clarendon Press. Cloth, 6s. 6d. net.

Readings from the Literature of Ancient Greece in English Translations. Edited by DORA PYM. Pp. 342. London: Harrap. Cloth, 3s. 6d.

THESE books are intended primarily for those who know no Greek and for the ordinary reader rather than the student, but they will also be very valuable to those who are studying the language but are not yet able to read at any pace. At this stage a boy of any intelligence wants to know not only about the author he is reading but also about Homer and Aeschylus and others of whom he hears. These books, which give well-chosen passages from good modern translations of the greatest Greek writers, help to supply the required knowledge, and in a very readable form. My own experience is that many boys will, with a little encouragement, read quantities of such literature in an

easy-going, unsystematic way, but with great advantage; above all, their interest in Greek is increased by this voluntary reading, and their belief that the classics are worth working at is strengthened. Mr. Livingstone gives them 436 pages to browse upon. 'It is not,' as he says, 'a mere anthology. I have tried, as far as possible, to piece the passages together in a continuous whole, and, further, to trace the growth of Greek literature, and indicate the historical background in which it is set.' I need hardly say that all this is admirably done; Mr. Livingstone's introductions and comments add greatly to the interest and value of the extracts.

There is also an edition 'abridged for use in schools' (240 pp., 2s. 6d.), a very good book for the money; but those who can, should get the full edition; in the other many good things are necessarily omitted.

Mrs. Pym's is a somewhat easier and simpler book on the same lines. It is

printed in large, clear type, a delightful book to dip into at one's leisure, useful too, but not quite full enough, for more systematic study. 'The principle of selection,' says the editor, 'has always been the power of a certain extract to interest the reader who knows no Greek, and the standard in choosing the translation has always been simplicity rather than literary' style, though

fortunately . . . the best literary version is often the simplest.' Mrs. Pym shows good judgment in her choice. I have tried this book and her companion volume *Readings from the Literature of Ancient Rome* with boys aged about fourteen who have gone a little way in Latin and Greek, and have found both books very popular.

W. E. P. PANTIN.

SOME GREEK VOLUMES OF THE LOEB LIBRARY.

Homer: The Iliad. With an English translation by A. T. MURRAY, Professor of Classical Literature, Stanford University, California. In two volumes. 1925.

Aristophanes. With the English translation of B. B. ROGERS. In three volumes. 1924.

Polybius. With an English translation by W. R. PATON. In six volumes: I., II., III., IV., 1922-5.

Dio's Roman History. With an English translation by E. CARY on the basis of the version of H. B. FOSTER. In nine volumes: VII., 1924.

(The Loeb Library. London: Heinemann; New York: Putnam. Cloth, each volume 10s. net.)

In a bilingual series Homer is best rendered into prose rather literal than not. Dr. Murray has struck a happy mean, 'true to the kindred points of Heaven and Home.' I have tried his version in many places, and have found it careful and judicious; the textual notes are businesslike; and the comments at the foot of the English tell much in little room. Perhaps rather more attention might have been paid to variant views of the meaning: for example, at I. 277-9¹ and XIV. 413. The Englishing of proper names is a thing for compromise, and I do not mind 'Aias' beside 'Peirithous': but why 'Achaea,' which is not even good Latin? There are slight misprints in the notes on X. 530 and XIII. 229, but in general the printing is very correct. The preface is discreetly 'unitarian.' There is a full index of proper names.

Readers who know some Greek but not very much—and to such the Loeb Library does its best service—will make little out of a literal translation of Aristophanes, and it is a happy arrangement which has given this series the use of Rogers's famous verse. Short selections from his introductions and notes have been made by the general editors, and plain English is suffixed in places when his version runs wide of the Greek, or plain Latin where it runs thin. To judge from a single play, this work is well done, though Tyre and Syme are different places (*Thesm.* 804), and 'priggish' is not quite right for *ὑώδεις* (273): *τοὐτὶ τὸ ῥῶ μοχθηρόν*. Each volume has an Index, which gives information supplementary to the notes. From the first of the three we learn that Harmodius was the brother of Aristogeiton, and that Socrates died in 499; from the first, that Simonides died in 467, from the second, that he died in 457; from the second and the third, that Pylos was taken by the Athenians in 424. Still, here is Rogers cheap at last.

Paton died in 1921, but it seems that his translation of Polybius was already complete. The short introduction is by H. J. Edwards, who died in 1923; and the editors of the series are seeing the work through the press. They might well have added a select *apparatus criticus*, and more notes on the matter of the text. As it is, text and translation are left very bare; the four volumes have only a few score footnotes. The Greek text is unadventurous. Ridiculous readings such as *Μασσαλίας* in II. 32.1 and *στεινότης* in III. 20.3 are printed and translated without

¹ See *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* for 1903, p. 12.

warning; so is the mistaken conjecture *Δία λιβόν* in III. 25. 6, 7. In the Greek text I have found very few misprints, but in the English text and the notes there are a good many slips—e.g., I. 73. 2 'quiqueremes' for *πεντηκοντόρους*, 75. 5 n. 'Bagraclas, II. 14. 11 n. 'Siniglia,' 19. 6 'Santinum,' III. 13. 5 n. 'Castala,' 61 'Quaestors' for *ἀγορανόμων*—and a few bad mistakes: 'its course, its reason, and its results' for *διὰ τίνων* (III. 3. 2), 'Seleucus the son of Nicanor' (X. 27. 11). Each volume has its own Index. Index IV. is careful, scholarly, serviceable; Index I. presents such items as *Aegos flumen, Amilcar, Ananes*, which occur neither in the English nor in the Greek, and it bestows on Antigonus Gonatas all that belongs to Doson; Index II. distinguishes these two men, though wrongly, but cannot tell Antiochus Magnus from Epiphanes, and its Latin admits such forms as *Canna, Cappadoci, Cephallenii, Corinthiaci*; Index III. distinguishes, wrongly, two Andromachi, but confuses two Antipatri. It is a pleasure to add that Paton's version is on the whole good, and a most welcome

relief from the priggish and ponderous Greek.

Dr. Cary's useful translation of Dio goes its workmanlike way. The present volume comprises Books LVI. to LX. The text cleaves to Boissevain; too closely, for in LVI. 3. 7 Bekker's ungrammatical conjecture *πολυπληθία* (where the accusative is necessary) was blindly accepted by Boissevain and is here handed on. On the other hand, good suggestions at LIX. 28. 9, 10 ('*τιοί*?' and '*οίτι*') and plenty elsewhere are ignored. Let me make two conjectures in passing. In LIX. 19. 4 *ἐπιλέγων* is absurd; the Vatican Excerpt (see Boissevain III., p. 738) points to *ἐπι λέγοντος*, 'while the accuser was still speaking,' in contrast with *ἐπειδὴ ὁ λόγος αὐτῷ ἐδόθη*, 'when it was the defendant's turn to speak.' In LX. 15. 1, *οὗτός τε γὰρ ἐκ τῶν ἐς τὴν ἡγεμονίαν μετὰ τὴν τοῦ Γαίου θάνατον προβληθέντων ἦν*, for *ἐκ* I propose *ἐς*. In LVI. 10. 2, *ταῖς ἀειπαρθένους πάνθ' ὅσα περ αἱ τεκνοῦσαι εἶχον ἐχαρίσατο*, the editors read *τεκούσαι*: but is it likely that error should have yielded the Sophoclean word?

E. HARRISON.

THE NEW LIDDELL AND SCOTT.

A Greek-English Lexicon, compiled by H. G. LIDDELL and R. SCOTT. A new edition, revised and augmented throughout by H. Stuart Jones, with the assistance of R. McKenzie. Part I.: *A-Ἀποβαίνω*. Pp. xlv + 192. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925. Paper, 10s. 6d. net; composition price for the whole work (ten parts), £4 4s.

No need to dwell upon the merits of this work, for it has been well advertised, and has been eagerly awaited by every scholar who deserves so great a boon.

Room for new matter has been made chiefly by a stricter code of abbreviations, by grouping cognate words under a single lemma as far as the alphabetical order allows, and by omitting many items which come from Patristic or Byzantine sources only. Pending the appearance of the Lexicon of Patristic Greek, and the Modern Greek Lexicon, we can perhaps spare the whole tribe

of 'Eccl.' and 'Byz.', though we shall have to use the eighth edition a little with the new. As to the abbreviations, we must bear with 'sts.' for 'sometimes,' but I wish that 'Dem.' for 'Demos-thenes' had been retained, since 'D.' followed by numerals only is apt to escape the eye. Nor do I like the grouping of important words under less important, as when *ἀγων-ἀρχης* heads the paragraph which includes *-ία, -ιάω, and -ίζομαι*. Another improvement, which would add very little to the bulk of the book, would be to give us sections, as well as books and chapters, in references to Herodotus and Thucydides. Look at the length of *Hdt. 9. 26* or *Thuc. 5. 47*.

I pass to some details.

ἀβρωσία. Since many 'received' conjectures are recorded, this word should be cited from *E. Hipp.* 136. Similarly, *ἀδαής* should be cited from *Theognis* 296 and 1310.

ἀγωγή. *Thuc.* 5. 85 is still quoted with the discredited reading *ὁμῶς*.

ἀγῶντα. This article might have made use of what Paton wrote in *C.R.* XXVII. (1913) 194.

Ἀθήναι means Attica in Hom. *Od.* 3. 278 as well as in Hdt.

The omission of ἀέλπολος, ἀκμάς, and ἀμφιφάων shows that the Oracula Chaldaica have not been fully explored.

ἀλεξίκακος. Ar. *Pax* 422 is no evidence that Hermes was so called.

ἀμαθής. For *not heard of, unknown* are cited only E. *Ion* 916, where see Murray and Bayfield, and Thuc. I. 140, where I take the meaning to be something like 'the turn of events may go as *stupidly* as the intentions of the individual man'—in the spirit of the saying, 'Nature is sometimes guilty of a very foolish sunset.'

ἀνακούω deserves mention for the sake of one view of Soph. *El.* 81.

ἀνάκρουσις in the modern sense has been ejected; a good riddance.

Under ἀνάσιλλος or ἀνάσιμος, or both, should be cited Herodas 4. 67.

Under ἀναπαράσσω we miss ἀναπαράξας, Solon ap. Ar. *Ath. Pol.* 13. 5.

Under ἀναφαίνω the mistake 'romancer' for λογογράφος survives, though under that word itself the eighth edition gives the true meaning, 'speech-writer.'

ἀνε need not mean *except, besides*, in Pl. *Critias* 112c, the only passage cited for that sense apart from the use with τοῦ and an

infinitive. A better instance is ἀνευ τοῦτον in Dem. 23. 112.

At the end of the article ἀντί the older editions gave ἀντίφορμος and ἀντίτροπος as their examples of ἀντί, meaning *corresponding, counter*, in composition. The new edition substitutes ἀντίφορος, which is not a good example. Doubtless ἀντίμορφος was meant, a word on which I had something to say in *C.R.* XXXIX. (1925) 55.

Under ἀπάντησις 'foreg.' is now misleading; and *meeting* is inadequate to Cicero's use of the word, for which see Tyrrell and Purser's Greek Index to his Correspondence (vol. vii., p. 123).

ἀπειρητος should be cited from Theognis 572 and 1104b, where it is used of men not tried and proved.

On the new edition's haphazard treatment of proper names see G. C. Richards in *Journ. Theol. Stud.* XXVII. (1925), 76. A good many addenda are given by P. Maas in *Gnomon* I. (1925).

Lest would-be buyers of this great work should be deterred by the fates of Passow-Crönert, which has stuck at ἀνά since 1914, and of *Epitome Thesauri Latini*, which expired on the word *aedilis*, be it noted that almost the whole 'copy' of the new Liddell and Scott (so the publishers tell us) is ready for the press. E. HARRISON.

A NEW MAGICAL PAPYRUS.

Papyri Osloenses. Fasc. I: Magical papyri edited by S. EITREM. Pp. 151, with thirteen plates. Published by Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo. Oslo, on commission by Jacob Dybwad, 1925. 20 kroner.

THE magical papyri of London, Paris, Leiden, and Berlin have been known to students for many years: Wessely's texts and indices, and the editions of Parthey, Dieterich, and Kenyon have made them accessible. Professor Eitrem, who in a series of papers has corrected a number of misreadings or misunderstandings in existing editions of the known papyri, has had the happy idea of writing a comprehensive commentary on a new papyrus of this kind which he bought recently in the Fayum. This idea he has carried out in a manner which it would be hard to praise enough; by his work and Hopfner's recent *Griechisch-ägyptischer Offenbarungszauber* the study of the subject is placed on a new footing.

This papyrus, like others of its kind,

contains a number of magical recipes. As we have them, they have been copied by a writer in the fourth century of our era: in their origin they probably go back to the Hellenistic age. Hence we can understand the familiarity with their contents shown by Theocritus (cf. l. 70 ἀγί[=εἰ] δὲ ἀνδρας γυνεξίν καὶ γυνῆκας ἀνδρεσιν καὶ παρθένους ἐκπηδᾶν οἰκοθεν ποιεῖ with Theocr. II. 136 σὺν δὲ κακαῖς μανίαις καὶ παρθένον ἐκ θαλάμοιο καὶ νύμφαν ἐφόβησ' ἔτι δέμνια θερμὰ λιποῖσαν ἀνέρος, and Eitrem 49. 136), and again by Lucan in *De bello civili* VI. All cults could be laid under contribution by the magician; Eitrem has remarked on the continued importance in them of the old Egyptian religious centres (p. 56), and also on the influence of the Septuagint and of Jewish and Christian doxologies (pp. 49, 108). In general it would be hard to add much to his notes, which contrive at the same time to give a mass of detailed information, and also to set in a clear perspective the larger problems

of religious history which arise in connexion with the text. Some points of detail may be noted. On p. 82 Eitrem says of the magical figure reproduced on Plate VII., 'Between the legs we observe a connecting-link which I am not able to explain.' Is it a fetter? (We may compare the representation of Attis with fettered feet¹ on the coins of Cyzicus, *B.M.C. Mysia*, 41 n. 175, Plate XI. 1, 50 n. 236, Plate XIII. 7, as explained by H. von Fritze, *Nomisma* IV. 36 f.) In illustration of the acclamation l. 216 ἀγαθέ(=αι) σου ὦραι, ἀγαθέ σου ἡμέραι, we should quote one found at Rome, καλή σου πᾶσα ὦρα, Σάραπι *Inscr. gr. ad res rom. pert.* I. 105). Here it is addressed to the Sun, who is invoked as ὁ ἀγαθὸς δαίμων τοῦ κόσμου: it will be remembered that Nero, elsewhere honoured as νέος ἥλιος, was in Alexandria venerated as νέος ἀγαθὸς δαίμων (*B.M.C. Alexandria* 20, n. 171, Plate XXVI. J. Vogt, *Die Alexandrinischen Münzen*, I. 28, notes documents in which he is called ἀγαθὸς δαίμων τῆς οἰκουμένης). Eitrem deals in several notes with the significance of the papyri

¹ A fettered Ares will be discussed in our next number.—ED. C.R.

for the development of liturgical form. On p. 46 he discusses the shift from the second person, as τέλει, to the third person, as γυγέσθω; it may be noted that a similar variation occurs in the Oscan curse of Vibia (R. G. Kent, *Class. Phil.* XX. 258).

In addition to the large magical papyrus, 371 lines in length, this fascicule includes two fragmentary texts, an exorcism, a Christian amulet earlier published by Eitrem and Fridrichsen with a valuable commentary (*Ein christliches Amulett, Videnskapsselskapets Forhandlingar*, 1921, i), and a horoscope.

The commentary on the chief papyrus and the translation thereof are written in excellent English. The format of the book is excellent; print and paper are very good, and the photographic plates are very valuable as reproducing the strange magical drawings. Typographical errors are few (p. 1, *though* for *thought*; p. 26, l. 1, 162 for 102; p. 81, Plate VI. for VII.; p. 84, Plate VII. for VIII.; p. 102, note on l. 276, P. Leid. 9. 1 for P. Leid. V. 9. 1). To commend such a work to the public is no small pleasure; εὐφρων πόνος εὐ τελέσασιν.

A. D. Nock.

THE GREEKS IN SPAIN.

The Greeks in Spain. By RHYS Carpenter. (Bryn Mawr Notes and Monographs.) Onevol. Pp.viii+180; 25 plates (mostly photographs; one or two sketches), 2 sketch-maps inside covers. Pennsylvania: Bryn Mawr College; London: Longmans, Green and Co. 7s. 6d. net.

THE author attempts to bring together into a connected outline the slender data available for Greek intercourse with Spain before the Roman period, and discusses the bearing on the story of certain artistic finds. A careful examination of the thousands of bronze statuettes found at Sta. Elena has convinced him that the influence of sixth-century Ionia is to be seen in three of the figures, but no Greek influence of a later period, and this accords, so far as it goes, with what we know of the Phocæan occupation of Tartessos, which he believes to have

been brought to an end by Carthage not later than 500. Similar evidence is to be found in the S.E. district. A Greek origin is claimed for the much-discussed Lady of Elche, and Greek inspiration for the statue from Cerro de los Santos known as Lady 3500, while the remarkable hooded and other figures from the same place are attributed to the native art when left to its own devices. Architecture can scarcely be said to exist (one fragment is discussed), but pottery again shows sixth-century Greek influence, and apparently no later contact until Hellenistic and Roman times. At Emporion, on the other hand, higher up the coast, we find clear evidence of an uninterrupted settlement from the end of the sixth century down to the Roman period, with such indications of prosperity as the fragment of a vase attributed to Makron, and the statue of Asklepios, which the author adduces

cogent reasons for regarding as an original Greek work of the fifth century.

Professor Carpenter believes that he has found the true site of Hemeroskopion at Punta d'Ifach, and that Strabo wrongly confused it with Dianium, the modern Denia. Apart from Strabo's statement everything seems to favour this identification, to which the author's argument and photographs lend the strongest support.

This evidence does not carry us very far, but where all is so dark even a little light was to be welcomed. Unfortunately Professor Carpenter's beam does not shine with consistent steadiness,

and in the all-important district of the S.E., the modern Murcia, his exposition fails altogether. He seems to have formulated two alternative theories about Greek influence in this region, one making the middle of the fifth century a terminus ad quem and the other a terminus a quo; and they play Box and Cox through his pages, while the Lady of Elche with obliging impartiality lends her support to one or other in turn. The results are disastrous, and in no way remedied by the otherwise convenient chronological table, nor by the belated attempt to mend matters in an appendix. There is a useful bibliography.

E. W. V. CLIFTON.

THE METGE CLASSICS.

First Series: Xenophontis *Memorabilia*, libri IV. Recognovit CAROLUS RIBA. Barcinone: ex typis Editorial Catalana, 1923. Pp. iv + 135. 4 pesetas 50 centimos. Xenofont, *Records de Sòcrates*. Traducció de CARLES RIBA. Barcelona: Editorial Catalana, 1923. Pp. xiv + 142. 4 pesetas 50 centimos. L. A. Sèneca, *De la Ira*. Text i traducció del Dr. CARLES CARDÓ. Barcelona: Editorial Catalana, 1924. Pp. xli + 208. 7 pesetas 50 centimos. M. T. Ciceró, *Brutus*. Text i traducció del Dr. GUMERSIND ALABART. Barcelona: Editorial Catalana, 1924. Pp. ix + 208. 7 pesetas 50 centimos. M. T. Ciceronis *Orationes* I. (*Pro P. Quinctio, Pro Sex. Roscio, Pro Q. Roscio Comoedo, Pro Tullio*). Recognoverunt I. M. LLOBERA, I. ESTELRICH. Barcinone: ex typis Editorial Catalana, 1923. Pp. vi + 126. 4 pesetas 50 centimos. Ausoni *Obres* I. Text i traducció de CARLES RIBA i ANTON NAVARRO. Barcelona: Editorial Catalana, 1924. Pp. xviii + 240. 7 pesetas 50 centimos. *Second Series*: Plató, *Diàlegs* II. (*Càrmides, Lísís, Protàgoras*). Text i traducció de JOAN CREXELLS. Barcelona: Tipografia Emporium, 1925. Pp. 290. 7 pesetas 50 centimos.

In reporting to readers of the *Classical Review* (vols. XXXII. p. 123, XXXV. p. 29) the formation of the Budé and Paravia classical libraries, Professor

Lindsay expressed the hope that Holland might soon follow suit. His wishes appear to have been anticipated by Catalonia, where the distinguished liberality and culture of Señor Cambó, admittedly the ablest financier among Spanish political leaders, and the erudite enthusiasm of Dr. J. Estelrich have created the Metge foundation for the edition and translation of Greek and Latin classics. These may be obtained in two forms—the 'basic' edition, issued at 7.50 pesetas per volume (bound in cloth, 9.50 pesetas), contains the classical text and Catalan translation, along with a biographical and bibliographical introduction in Catalan; but the languages may be separated so as to form two volumes (at 4.50 pesetas), the one containing the text and its *apparatus criticus*, and the other the Catalan version and introduction. The 'basic' edition may be purchased in separate volumes or in series of ten; the latter alternative costs in Barcelona 60 pesetas, abroad 80 pesetas, with an addition of 2 pesetas per volume when the cloth-binding is required.

The Bernat Metge Foundation takes its name from the writer whose style is regarded as the most pure example of the Catalan language, the translator of Petrarch's *Griselidis* and imitator of Cicero's *Tusculans*. In this he is in some measure a counterpart to Guillaume Budé, and the French series

running under this name is the immediate model of the Catalan; indeed, rearranged under a different chairmanship, and on one occasion meeting on the following day, the Metge committee is transformed into the Catalan section of the Association Guillaume Budé. They have taken over from the senior body the general disposition of their issues, and an unusually attractive font of square, black Greek lettering. The Latin type they use is, however, of a better quality, the subordination of the notes more marked, the paper whiter, and the margins wider, so that the total effect of the Metge typography is of a higher beauty than the French, and compares on equal terms with the best English work. Equally, or even more, notable is the accuracy of the proof-reading in a country where specialised typesetters do not exist, and this reflects the highest credit on the editors. The first series, issued in 1923 and 1924, included works of Lucretius, Nepos, Cicero, Seneca, Ausonius, Plato (the Socratic dialogues), and Xenophon, some of which are listed above; the second continues the edition of Plato, and includes also Tibullus, Propertius, Tacitus, Pliny the Elder, Aulus Gellius, Quintus Curtius, and Plutarch. The programme of the Foundation envisages the edition of all the works of the authors selected, so that, for example, those of Ausonius, when completed, will occupy three tomes. There is a considerable bias in favour of the Latin classics.

The texts are eclectic, with a conservative tendency. Each work is accompanied by an elaborate statement of the manuscript tradition, and a more moderate enumeration of editions later than the *principes*; but it does not appear that reference has been made in any case to the manuscripts themselves, this statement serving rather as an exposition of the authority under which the Catalan editors agree with or differ from the leading modern issues. Of these, four—the Teubner, Budé, Oxford, and (to a limited extent) the Paravia texts—are taken into account. Cicero's *Orations* follows readings intermediate between the Oxford and the Budé, and includes a list of its variations from the

revised Teubner; the *Brutus* is Teubner collated with Oxford and Budé; the *Memorabilia* mainly Teubner, as the editor considers the Oxford text too conservative; the *De Ira* most resembles Budé. For Ausonius the editors have had before them the Teubner issue, which they have compared with the edition in the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, and with the late Professor de la Ville de Mirmont's redaction of the *Mosella*; they have, however, profited by the sympathetic interest of the latter scholar, and on that ground 'a considerable part of this our edition can be considered original and superior to its predecessors' (p. xviii). In general, within the limits of 'editions of editions,' the Metge texts are worthy of the attention of serious scholars. In the introductions and annotations an English reader cannot fail to note the comparatively small influence our scholarship has had on these issues. Apart from the relevant Oxford editions, I have noted only a remark by Dakyns (*Classical Review* VII., p. 259), another by Lord Macaulay, a reference to Mr. Bernard Russell, and Sister Byrne's notes on Ausonius. The quotations made from our tongue are first-hand, and bespeak a certain familiarity with our studies; the editors are very well-read in German and French criticism; they recur at all points to their originals, and at their best, as in the introductions to Seneca and to Ausonius, could hardly be surpassed for concise, first-hand and relevant information by M. Boissier himself.

The principal interest of the translations consists in their modern application. The Catalan Renaissance has been disposed to seek inspiration too exclusively in the latest novelties of the Quartier Latin, and Dr. Estelrich and his colleagues propose to withstand these degenerate enthusiasms by referring the cultured public of Catalonia back to the permanent models of taste and conduct—*quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*. The matter is thus presented with an eye to actuality, which may sometimes discourage a minute accuracy of rendering (e.g. *ὁὐκ ἠθέλησεν ἐπιψηφίσαι*—*s'oposà a la votació*), but undoubtedly makes for read-

ableness, usually accompanied by strict fidelity. The Catalan language, eminently pliable in vocabulary and rhythm, and almost entirely free from preconceptions of phrase, is an admirable instrument for translation; and that the Metge Foundation has already achieved success as a preceptor of modern prose style may be inferred from Dr. Montoliu's judgment that Father Cardó's version of Seneca has discovered a new resonance and conciseness in the Catalan tongue. The *Memorabilia* is destined to become in Barcelona, as in Athens, the ethical code of the practical citizen; Seneca's eclectic Stoicism still retains its

curious affinity with Spanish moral tendencies, and no doubt Plato's dialogues were selected for translation on similar grounds. Some English readers may feel inclined to combine classical reading with the acquisition of a most interesting neo-Latin tongue, and all champions of the historic disciplines must be interested in this large-hearted attempt to base a modern culture directly on the texts of antiquity. In no part of Europe do literary conditions present to the classical disciplines anything so like a *tabula rasa*, and the success of Dr. Estelrich's projects cannot fail to be deeply instructive.

WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE.

SCHOOL BOOKS.

THE following five books are in the Clarendon series (3s. 6d. net each) in which the author's work is presented partly in the original and partly in translation. All the editors feel strongly the interest of the works they edit, and know a great deal about them; I feel sure that the boys and girls for whom they write will like these books and learn much from them.

THE GEORGICS are edited by the late John Sargeaunt (who wrote *The Trees, Shrubs, and Plants of Virgil*) and T. F. Royds (the author of *The Beasts, Birds, and Bees of Virgil*). The notes give much interesting information about the life of the countryside. It seems a pity that some of the most attractive passages (e.g. II. 136-176 and 490-542) are given only in translation. One looks for *Felix qui potuit* and one finds 'Happy the man who has been able to learn the causes of things.' If only the text were printed beside it, a prose version such as this would interest and instruct many young readers; they would not regard it as unattractive English, but as a help to the understanding of Virgil, as a model worthy of imitation. But without the text it is of little value. Fortunately Mr. Royds has taken 'the liberty' of giving in many places a verse translation instead of Sargeaunt's prose. He has used sometimes his own blank verse, sometimes R. D. Blackmore's rhymed translation. Most boys will read these and enjoy them.

AENEID VII.-IX., edited by R. A. Knox. This is a very lively edition; the notes are written in a forcible, unconventional style, e.g. 'If you have any sense you will learn these lines by heart.' The editor prides himself on not following modern fashions. He has a great affection for 'the old blue "pocket" edition of the Clarendon Press' (was not Parker the publisher?), 'the edition in which I first met Virgil, in which I carried him about with me when, at an important moment of my life, I half looked to him as a counsellor.' So he prints *jam* and *quum* and *latè*, and puts the long mark over certain final syllables. As he says, 'a few simple typographical devices may make a world of difference'; yet he does not mark the quantities in the Vocabulary, except here and there, and the reader who is in doubt how to pronounce a new word will look in vain for guidance. This is a very serious defect. Why not show the difference between *arbore* and *clangore*, *cāno* and *cāno*? If Vocabularies are given, they ought to be not less helpful than a general dictionary; it is, of course, easy to make them much more helpful.

HANNIBAL'S INVASION OF ITALY (i.e. Livy XXI.-XXII., reduced to about 80 pp., parts of the text being represented by summary) is a very stimulating book for boys of about fourteen. Mr. J. Jackson is an admirable editor. He has sound knowledge, an interest in his subject which makes him care to verify

every statement, great power as a writer. His Introduction is a remarkable piece of work; it tells so much and tells it so well. He is, I think, a little too fond of pointing out Livy's faults. One reads too often such words as 'the merest phrase-making,' 'placing one more blunder to Livy's account.' Is it not more important to make boys feel that Livy is well worth reading? The Vocabulary is good, but need one be so parsimonious as to print *imp-ono*, *-osui*; *anc-eps*, *-ipitis*? This obscures the etymology and encourages a bad pronunciation; the saving of space is negligible.

In his edition of *THE CLOUDS* Mr. Cyril Bailey makes use of the spirited translation written by himself and Dr. A. D. Godley for the performance of the play by the O.U.D.S. in 1905. Of course some passages are omitted; for class use it would perhaps be better if the vigorous rendering of line 193 were cut out. The Introduction and Notes are full of good teaching for a boy who is just beginning to be a scholar. Here and there I wish the editor had given us a little more; e.g. on the translation of 275 ff. (*ἀέναοι Νεφέλαι*) he says, 'This is one of the most beautiful pieces of Aristophanes' lyric writing, and the Greek should be read to get the sound and rhythm of it.' But he does not quote the Greek. He has some very good remarks (p. 23) on the language. 'We gain from it a clear notion of current Athenian idiom . . . we must be ready at any moment to detect the change into a mock-tragic style—marked by a greater strictness of metre.' I wish he had added a page or two on the iambic trimeter, showing the main differences between tragedy and comedy. A full exposition of the metre—something like Hardie's in *Res Metrica*, but easier—would add greatly to the value of any edition intended for this stage. It is a subject in which boys are easily interested, but it needs to be treated at length with plenty of examples. The Vocabulary has many good points, but the scholar who made it for Mr. Bailey has not been at all particular to keep to

'current Athenian idiom'; indeed, Aristophanes would be vastly amused if he could read some of the forms of common verbs which are here ascribed to him; e.g. he would learn that the future of 'to hear' is *ἀκούσω*, that of 'to go' *ελεύσομαι* (or *εἶμι*). One might as truly say that in modern colloquial English the past of 'to climb' is 'clomb' (or 'climbed').

Dr. J. T. Sheppard is well qualified to edit the *Hecuba*. He admires the play and helps one to appreciate it as a work of art; his stage directions and notes on the dramatic effect of some of the lines are unusually good. Nor does he neglect linguistic difficulties. I think it would be well to give the reader, who will probably have read no other play, a little more help in the Vocabulary; e.g., such a form as *οὔμός* may be new to him; if he needs to look up *μολεῖν* will he know that it 'comes from' *βλώσσω*?

Messrs. Methuen publish (1) *LATIN UNSEENS FOR MIDDLE FORMS*, selected by L. D. Wainwright (1s. 6d.); (2) *LATIN PASSAGES FOR TRANSLATION AT SIGHT*, selected by Hilda Richardson (2s.), intended especially for students who are reading for a Pass degree. Both are good. The passages are of suitable difficulty and of interest, many of them of remarkable interest, out of their context. References are given and an index of authors by which one can easily find any piece.

CAMILLA, a Latin Reading Book, written by Maud Reed (Macmillan, 2s.), 'is intended primarily as a story book, and its object is to stimulate the interest and imagination of the child until that stage is reached when real Latin may be tackled.' Miss Reed is very successful. She is herself much interested in Italy and Greece (both ancient and modern), and her stories, written in an easy, fluent style, will arouse the interest of her young readers and help to accustom them to Latin. As the Romans have left us no continuous easy writing, we must supply the deficiency.

W. E. P. PANTIN.

VERSES AND TRANSLATIONS.

1. *Ros Rosarum*. By A. B. RAMSAY. Pp. vi + 126. Cambridge: University Press, 1925. Cloth. 6s. 6d. net.
2. *Theocritus, Bion, and Moschus*. Translated into English verse by J. H. HALLARD. Fourth Edition. Pp. xvi + 217. London: Routledge; New York: Dutton. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
3. *The Sonnets of Shakespeare with a Latin Translation*, by A. T. BARTON. Pp. vi + 155. London: Hopkinson, 1923. Boards, 18s. net.

1. MR. RAMSAY'S book deserves its pretty title: his verses, whether Latin or English, original or translated, are dainty things. In Latin, which chiefly concerns the *Review*, his translations, written in many metres, give ample proof of his resource and dexterity; but we find his original verse even more attractive. For this purpose he uses the elegiac metre by preference. He has a pleasant and kindly fancy, a sure command of good Latin, and a fine ear for metre. Some of the couplets are not the least attractive things in his little book; here is a pretty puzzle which hardly needs an Oedipus:

*ova anatum in campo tu me, puer, auspice
frangis;
deme novem: passer quo capiat, habes.*

Sal, merum sal is the natural comment. Martial, after receiving a good deal of preliminary instruction, would have enjoyed this couplet: in fact, Mr. Ramsay might have ventured to send his *passer* to Martial.

2. Mr. Hallard's translation of Theocritus into English verse is now published in a fourth revised edition. It has evidently found readers and given them pleasure. The main peculiarity which distinguishes it from other translations of Theocritus is the great variety of metres employed—'nearly a score,' says the author in his preface. We do not ourselves feel that the bucolic hexameter needs to be translated in so many different ways, but we are conscious that Mr. Hallard has studied the text with care and uses his twenty metres with skill. The charm of Theocritus is an evanescent thing, and we find more of it in Lang's prose translation than in any other rendering known to us.

3. A. T. Barton's translation of Shakespeare's Sonnets into Latin elegiacs, first printed in 1913, is here issued as No. II. of the New Aldine Library.¹ The printing is beautiful; but the text is not entirely free from errors: xcvi, 1 begins *te simi*.

Owing to the language of the Sonnets, always pregnant and sometimes very obscure, such a translation is a task of great difficulty. Many scholars have picked out a Sonnet here and there and turned it into elegiacs; but to translate the whole series is a very different matter. We are told that for forty years Barton gave the leisure of a busy life to this task. The rendering is remarkable for terseness of expression and closeness to the original. If some passages hardly read like Latin, it is because the writer has carried this closeness too far.

The style and metre are unlike Ovid: the verse is slow and weighty; it reminds one rather of Lucretius. Yet Barton steadily observed the disyllabic ending for the pentameter; though the seven pentameters of cxlvi all end with words like *imperio*, we have noticed no other exceptions.

We quote three versions of the conclusion of xviii, by Kennedy (*Between Whiles*, p. 13), Barton, and Mr. A. B. Ramsay (*Ros Rosarum*, p. 51), and have arranged them in the order of our preference:

- (i.) nunquam vana suis te Mors adscripserit
umbris,
sed tuus aeterno nomine crescet honos:
dum spirare homines, oculi dum cernere
possunt,
vivit teque vetat nostra Camena mori.
- (ii.) Mors nihil ipsa suis de te iactabit in um-
bris
Carmine in aeterno dum sine fine vires;
Donec homo spirabit enim, poteritque
videre,
Vivit in hoc uitae carmine causa tuae.
- (iii.) Longius—errantem nec Dis iactabit in
umbris—
traxeris aetatem, vate vetante mori.
Dum spirant homines, dum pascunt lumina
visus,
vivit et, ut vivas, haec mea Musa facit.

J. D. DUFF.

¹ No. I. is a handsome reprint of *The Thoughts of the Emperor Marcus Aurelius* translated by George Long (10s. 6d.).

THE DIRECT METHOD.

Latin on the Direct Method. By W. H. D. ROUSE, Litt.D., and R. B. APPLETON, M.A. University of London Press, Ltd., 1925. 7s. 6d. net.

Primus Annus. By W. L. PAINE and C. L. MAINWARING. Second edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925. 3s. net.

DR. ROUSE will presumably be known as the last of the Headmasters. The title continues to be awarded to personages whose staff is chosen by Governors, whose curriculum is determined by the Board of Education, and whose finance is regulated by Viscount Burnham, but whose ambition goes no further than to take over a system which is in excellent working order, and to pass it on uninjured to their successors. Dr. Rouse himself has undertaken to remodel and inspire the minds not only of his scholars but of his colleagues; and, bringing to his task a wide scholarship, unflinching determination, and an all-absorbing sympathy with boy nature, he has won a success which no one disputes. But on the question whether that success is due to the man or to the system which he advocates opinions differ.

By the 'Direct Method' in the teaching of French we mean the policy of so surrounding the pupil with a French atmosphere that he learns the language as a child does, without conscious effort. Since the surroundings of a French child do not differ greatly from those of an English pupil, the change is almost entirely in words. This is impossible with Latin. To translate into Latin 'Open the window, look at the aeroplane, poke the fire, and then brush your trousers,' we should need first to create a new Latin language; and, having acquired it, should have made very little progress towards any of the aims which are extolled by those who believe in classical education. Messrs. Paine and Mainwaring grapple boldly with this difficulty by giving lessons first in geography, and then in the daily life of the Roman pupil and the Roman soldier. Their book is attractive and richly illustrated; the grammar is short and well-chosen. In

the Syntax difficulty occurs, and presumably further explanations in English are not excluded; even so common an idiom as *adime mihi* is passed over, although *ferulae subduximus* is one of the earliest phrases introduced by Mr. Appleton. The passive voice and the subjunctive mood are not reached either in the *accidence* or the *syntax*. Thus attention is rightly concentrated for the first year on the vocabulary. Mr. Appleton finds that *Primus Annus* is dull and uninspired, but this may be the price necessarily paid for a carefully elaborated system.

Those who read the account of the work done in the first four years of the Perse School course will be astonished at its compass and interest, and will not be disposed to question its value. Strictly speaking, it cannot be called 'Latin on the Direct Method,' for at no stage is the use of English excluded. But it is Latin enlivened by a direct appeal to the eye and ear, and by a complete familiarity on the part of the teacher with all the tools of his trade. It is well insisted that the teacher must constantly be reading Latin for himself, thus breathing the atmosphere with which he wishes to encircle his pupil. When the time comes that the learner has familiarised himself with the elements, the English language will be increasingly used both for translation and comment. The advocates of the 'Direct Method' do not altogether ignore the usual criticisms that the method allows the duller pupils to evade their task, and that in the earlier stages it lacks the interest which attaches to the reading of 'real Latin.' It is hardly likely that these books will make many converts, but they should root out the common belief that the teaching of the elements is an easy or a mechanical task; the teacher must be thoroughly interested in the work before he can inspire interest in others. The vicious lack of system, by which each class teacher is allowed to use his own methods, ought certainly to be no longer tolerated; but if all the teachers in a school pull together, experience will show how much share can wisely

be allotted to each instrument of progress. To say the least, the advocates of the Direct Method are all

alive, and this is the first condition of success.

E. V. ARNOLD.

MODONA'S CORTONA.

Cortona etrusca e romana nella storia e nell' arte. By A. NEPPI MODONA. Pp. xix + 186. Twenty-seven plates + sixteen plans and illustrations in the text. Florence: Bemporad, 1925. Lire 55.

THIS is, as its title implies, a monograph on the history and archaeology of Cortona in the classical period. In Part I. (43 pages) the author discusses at some length (perhaps unnecessary) the various accounts of the origin of the city, particularly the traditions of a Pelasgian settlement there which are preserved by Hellanicus and Herodotus.¹ It is comforting to find that after all the author does not attach overmuch value to these traditions, and concludes that Cortona was founded by the Etruscans at a date unknown, and after a period of prosperity and power made terms with Rome about 310 B.C. That is really all we know of the history of the city.

For Part II. (Archaeology) there is more satisfactory material. The author describes first the remains of the Etruscan city-walls—the 'diadem of towers' of Macaulay's *Lays*—and of various Etruscan and Roman buildings within the city, assigning the oldest parts of the walls to the sixth and fifth centuries. We are grateful for the reminder (pp. 50-51) that the distinction between the 'polygonal' and 'quadrangular' styles of masonry depends less upon date than upon the kind of stone used. The next chapter deals with the Etruscan tombs in the neighbourhood of Cortona, in particular the 'Tomb of Pythagoras' (which is tentatively assigned to the fifth or fourth century B.C.), the Tomba del Sodo, and the 'Melone' of Camucia, which

must be included in the group of 'orientalising' tombs of the eighth and seventh centuries, along with the Regulini-Galassi tomb at Caere, the Bernardini and Barberini tombs at Praeneste, and certain tombs at Vetulonia, Veii, Tarquinii, and Cumae.² Subsequent chapters describe the inscriptions and sepulchral urns found in and near Cortona, the painting known as the 'Muse Polyhymnia,' the Etruscan bronzes (including, of course, the famous lamp) in which Cortona is particularly rich, and finally the coinage. The author's commendable caution in accepting unproven theories (a virtue not always found in Etruscologists) is shown by his criticism (p. 169) of Milani's association of the so-called 'Attis' coins with the Corybantic religion of Phrygia and Crete.

To attempt any detailed criticism of this book would demand an acquaintance with Cortona and its monuments which the present reviewer does not possess. It will be read with interest by any lover of antiquity who contemplates a visit to Cortona, and will prove a valuable book of reference to students of the architecture, the bronze-work, and the coinage of ancient Etruria. Other volumes in the same series, which emanates from the University of Florence, deal with the Aeolian Islands, the archaic necropolis of Populonia (by Professor A. Minto), and the Cults and Myths of Magna Graecia. Further such monographs on the archaeology of (e.g.) Tarquinii, Volsinii, or Veii will be welcomed by all interested in Etruscan studies.

R. A. L. FELL.

¹ Dionys. I. 28. 3, 29. 3; Hdt. I. 57.

² See Karo in *Bullettino di paletnologia italiana*, XXX. (1904), pp. 1-29.

WHERE HANNIBAL PASSED.

Where Hannibal Passed. By ARTHUR RIVERS BONUS, Indian Civil Service (retired). One vol. Pp. viii+88; 12 illustrations (from photographs) and sketch map. London: Methuen, 1925. 7s. 6d.

THE author's theory is that 'Hannibal crossed the Rhone at Tarascon,' and after 'crossing the Rhone he intended to march up that river to its confluence with the Isère, thence up the latter stream to Grenoble, and so to Vizille at the lower end of the defile of the Romanche; up this defile to Bourg d'Oisans; over the Col de Lauteret and down the valley of the Guisane to Briançon; and thence over the Mont Genève pass into Italy.' . . . 'Everything went according to plan until he arrived at Briançon. There he was led astray by the local guides. They lured him up the valley of the Cerveyrette to the Col de Malrif, on approaching which the tribesmen attacked his column; and after this the Carthaginians found their way down to Abriès, and finally into Italy over the Col de Malaure.'

But why should Hannibal choose this ridiculous route for going from Tarascon to the Mont Genève, when there was a direct route along the Durance all the way? The author's answer is that Livy 'expressly states that Hannibal's route from the Rhone crossing was not the direct route to the Alps.' Livy's statement is that Hannibal kept clear of Scipio by diverging from the direct route. I

imagine that Hannibal resumed the direct route as soon as he found out that Scipio had re-embarked.

The distances that Hannibal marched are given in Polybius, III. 39. The author gets rid of them by rejecting III. 39 and calling it Pseudo-Polybius. He does not, however, attribute III. 50. 1 or III. 56. 3 to his Pseudo-Polybius; and these passages say that Hannibal marched 100 miles in ten days and 150 in fifteen days. That is an average of 10 miles a day, whereas the author repeatedly assumes an average of 22 miles a day. Without these assumptions of his, his route for Hannibal is much too long.

The author says, 'What had evidently struck Polybius more than anything else in what he had seen of Hannibal's route was a surprising view, from the pass, of the plains of Italy lying below.' There is such a view from the Col de Malrif and from the Col de Malaure; and the author makes Hannibal cross both these Cols, though there is nothing in Livy or Polybius about two views. The Col de la Traversette commands as good a view; and as he brings Hannibal to Abriès, he might as well take him over the Traversette, that being (as he admits) an easier pass than the Malaure. Hannibal could have reached Abriès from Tarascon by following the Durance and the Guil—a much more likely route.

The author has been over the ground, and gives good photographs of what he conceives to be Hannibal's Pass.

CECIL TORR.

LATIN LITERATURE BEFORE GREEK INFLUENCE.

La letteratura latina anteriore all' influenza ellenica. By ENRICO COCCHIA. Three vols. Vol. I., pp. x+264; Vol. II., pp. vii+197; Vol. III., pp. xi+397. Naples: Rondinella and Loffredo, 1924-25. Vol. I., Lire 12; Vol. II., Lire 10; Vol. III., Lire 20.

FOR the one or two brief chapters of mingled tradition and conjecture found in the standard histories of Latin literature as to the origins and character of the native Latin (or Italian) produc-

tions older than direct or indirect Hellenic influence, Professor Cocchia has sought to substitute a much larger bulk of ascertained fact—not three volumes, for what is knowledge of that early Latin literature (and few will be found nowadays to deny its existence altogether) will not fill three volumes. There can be no history (except an imaginative one) of a literature which is unknown save in a few short fragments, and those, at least as we have

them, of no very great literary interest. The first and second, then, of Professor Cocchia's volumes are devoted to an analysis of a considerable number of the myths, traditions and legends embodied in the transmitted literature; for Professor Cocchia sweeps away the generally accepted view that Latin literature was in the main inspired by Greek literature as involving an impossible literary 'miracle,' an incredibly rapid assimilation.

After stating this extreme view, which is to be condemned for its extremity just as much as the view that denies Latin literature any native genius whatsoever, he submits to a critical examination—as a sample (*cf.* also his essay 'La leggenda di Coriolano e le origini della poesia in Roma' of 1896)—the traditional account of the Gallic invasion and of the subsequent episode of Camillus, and deduces the existence of a native Roman *saga* (Vol. I., chapter 1-3). The remainder of Vol. I. and part of Vol. II. contain a similar study of the mythology that grew up around Roman religion (he deals in great detail with the myths associated with the cults of Jupiter, Juno, Minerva, Janus, Diana, Mars, the Lares and the Manes), with results that are hardly likely to commend themselves to serious students of Roman religion. Next more legends, from Evander onwards, are analysed in turn (rest of Vol. II.).

Anyone who has ever attempted a similar piece of work will well know that in all this Professor Cocchia is working over a field that is full of snares and pitfalls. There is hardly any branch of Classical research in which there are so many false turnings to entice the adventurous, which is so exposed to individual interpretations

and arbitrary conclusions, and which so seldom yields any solid results, as the attempt, nearly always vain, to disentangle the old from the new, the native from the exotic in the traditions of early Rome. Up to a certain point foreign invention (usually Greek) can be detected at a glance; after that you may 'prove' (to your own satisfaction, perhaps, if you be not too critical of your own work) anything you wish, and you cannot even verify your own conclusions. Many dusty volumes, from Klausen's downwards, have been compiled in this idle endeavour. And Professor Cocchia, whose way is what the French call 'très personnel,' and at times almost wilful, goes very much his own way. Even in his third volume, where he is on surer ground in dealing with the few extant monuments of the oldest Latin, theory preponderates. It is excellent that he looks beyond Rome (the dialects are laid under contribution wherever possible, *e.g.* in his study of *elogia*), but the results to be gleaned are necessarily meagre owing to sheer lack of materials. No attempt is made to investigate the story of the *novi poetae*, the movement (Professor Lindsay calls it 'Keltic') which prepared the way for Vergil.

It would be hard to overpraise the industry which Professor Cocchia has brought to his well-nigh impossible and in part fruitless task; the lively style in which he has set forth his views; and the ingenuity with which he supports them. But it must be confessed that amongst much in his book which those who are interested in the springs of Latin literature will find that is new, there is little which they will find that is convincing.

J. WHATMOUGH.

ROM ÜBER ALLES?

Von den Ursachen der Grösse Roms. Rede gehalten beim Antritt des Rectorats an der Universität Leipzig am 31 Oktober 1921. Von RICHARD HEINZE. Second impression, 1925. Pp. 35. Leipzig: Teubner. 1.80 g.m. This little work is an attempt to account for the greatness of ancient

Rome as the natural outcome of Roman character. The Rome contemplated is Rome in healthy and solid growth, before the corruption and decline of inner soundness that may be said to begin after the overthrow of Carthage; that is, down to about 200 B.C. Such a psychological study from a distinguished

German scholar cannot but be interesting. In an address composed for delivery within a limited time it was inevitable that the force of the argument should suffer from its compression, and the reader may fairly wish that some of the opinions were more fully supported by relevant detail.

The main thesis is that what really made Rome expand and rule was the steady Will ever present in the people, both individually and collectively, operating to that end. From this arose their devotion to *res publica*, overriding even the claims of *res privata*. To make that Will effective, firm and continuous leadership was necessary. From this necessity was developed the ample *imperium* of magistrates chosen by a people that had learnt to obey. Most characteristic of Rome was the fact that politicians were officials, men whose worthiness had been approved by popular choice. Continuity was secured by the Senate, in which ex-magistrates contributed experience. The *auctoritas* of that body was not a statutory governing power, but an irresistible moral force guiding responsible magistrates. Thus Roman character and Roman Will created institutions fitted to express their permanent desire of expansion and control, practically and effectively. And their working of these institutions is the story of the rising greatness of Rome.

In short, Rome became great because the Romans (whoever they were) were Romans. And this is no mere platitude,

but a doctrine carefully expounded with due consideration of such matters as the family-system, the education by apprenticeship, the exclusive nature of the Roman *civitas*, the incorporation and assimilation of aliens (freedmen, etc.), and many more. Where I find the work disappointing is in the absence of consciousness that the later degeneration of Roman life was at least partly due to defects in the Roman character and institutions of earlier times. In other words, why did the 'good old Rome' so quickly go to pieces through contact with the outer world? Was there not something wrong inside? I think there was, and that Roman history cannot be fairly written without serious discussion of these questions.

Dr. Heinze pronounces the Romans to have been *Machtmenschen*. Perhaps so: but I note that he is at the same time eager to assert that this is a title to which Germans do not aspire. Very good, but I cannot resist a suspicion that some of his audience may have smiled. And it would be rash to guess how far his views on Roman psychology may have been unconsciously warped a little by the experiences of the last fifty years. As one who owns a drop or two of German blood I can follow his argument with sympathy rather than full conviction. Vergil's boast of Rome's imperial mission sounds natural enough in its own age. But that *Rom über alles* would have been an adequate version of early Roman sentiment I am not quite ready to admit.

W. E. HEITLAND.

ST. AUGUSTINE'S CONFESSIONS.

Saint Augustin: Confessions, Livres I.-XVIII. Texte établi et traduit par P. de Labriolle. Pp. xxxi+202. Paris: Soc. d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1925.

THIS is the first instalment of a translation of the 'Confessions' undertaken for the Association Guillaume Budé by Professor de Labriolle of Poitiers. It may be said at once without hesitation that the work promises well. M. de Labriolle prefixes a short Introduction, of which the most interesting section is a discussion of the

MSS. He breaks a lance with P. Knöll, the editor of the 'Confessions' in the Vienna Corpus, whom he blames for a slavish adherence to Codex Sessorianus (S) as surpassing the rest *et ætate et præstantia*. Readers of the *Classical Review* need hardly be reminded that here is a very dangerous principle. As a matter of fact, S omits words which are necessary to sense or grammar, e.g. 'Perueni (occulte) ad uinculum fruendi' (III. i. 1); 'gaudebat mendicus ille uinulentia, tu (gaudere cupiebas) gloria' (VI. vi. 10); 'si corpus meum in locum

illum trahitis (et ibi constituitis),’ etc. (VI. viii. 13); ‘aperuit (oculos) et percussus est . . . uulnere,’ etc. (*ib.*) The famous ‘tolle lege’ passage in VIII. xii. 29 is spoilt in S by the reading ‘de diuina domo’ for ‘de uicina domo.’ And Knöll accepts this, at least in his *ed. maior*! Finally, the scribe of S had not the wit to see what Knöll’s acumen lead him to conjecture, that the vulgarism noted by Augustine in I. xviii. 29 is not ‘inter hominibus’ but ‘inter omnes.’ It was time that S should be dethroned from its pride of place and the Benedictines restored to credit. There is no question that they reflect the mind and expression of Augustine more faithfully than some modern editors who have a more scientific equipment and method.

M. de Labriolle as a translator is conscientious and clear, shirking no difficulties. That he succeeds in recovering the fire and glitter of the original can hardly be said. It would need a Pascal or a Victor Hugo to do that, and everyday French must seem to the English reader somewhat lacking in dignity beside Augustine’s Latin.

What can be done with an idiom that renders ‘etiam sic, Domine, etiam sic’ by ‘C’est cela, Seigneur, c’est bien cela,’ and ‘oro te, deus meus,’ by ‘permettez-moi de le dire, ô mon Dieu’? At the same time French sometimes lends itself to a happy play upon words, *e.g.* ‘disert’ and ‘désert,’ and the Latin order can be retained with considerable closeness.

An instance of M. de Labriolle at his best is the following (II. ii. 2): ‘Votre colère s’était appesantie sur moi, et je l’ignorais. Au fracas des chaînes de ma mortalité, j’étais devenu sourd; j’expiais ainsi la superbe de mon âme. Et je m’éloignais toujours plus loin de vous, et vous me laissiez faire. Ballotté au gré de mes fornications, j’y répandais, j’y gaspillais ma force effervescente; et vous vous taisiez.’

The foot of the Latin page has a critical apparatus, and the French has short notes. These are generally informative, though the one on *Sacramentum* on p. 125 is both faulty and misleading. I have noted slight misprints on pp. 53 and 178.

H. F. STEWART.

THE LETTERS OF ERASMUS.

Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterdami. Denuo recognitum et auctum per P. S. ALLEN, M.A., et H. M. ALLEN. Tom. V., 1522-1524. Pp. xxiii + 631; with 4 plates. Oxonii: In Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1924. 28s. net.

THE great edition of Erasmus’ correspondence with friends, patrons, potentates, and enemies is carried an important step forward by a volume which covers three very busy and very anxious years of Erasmus’ life. It contains 283 letters, 180 by and 103 to Erasmus. The vast majority deal almost entirely with Erasmus’ attitude to the religious controversies now become acute and threatening a great schism in the Church.

During these three years Erasmus, in spite of the voluminous correspondence he was obliged to keep up, by unflagging industry finished his Paraphrases on the New Testament, a work

far more important than religious polemics would have been. It is highly to his credit that he constantly used what influence he possessed in favour of mild measures and against persecution. It was only in the Netherlands that persecution went to great lengths in these years, and he invokes Ferdinand’s intervention with Margaret the Regent to silence his enemy the Carmelite Egmondanus (1515), to whom this was largely due. He was constantly being pressed to go to France, and the non-payment of his pension as counsellor to Charles V. was an argument in favour of accepting the liberal offers of Francis I. enforced in an autograph letter, of which we have a facsimile (1375). But while there was war between Francis and his Imperial master he could not induce himself to take the step, in spite of the pressure of Budé, sometimes (1446) couched in Plutarchian Greek.

Relations with England seem not to have been so intimate as in previous years. He writes to Henry VIII., Warham, Wolsey, Tunstall, Abbot Bere, and others, particularly when sending them the *De Libero Arbitrio*; but there is an absence of letters to him from England. It is interesting to find him writing in intimate fashion to Polydore Vergil (1494); and his letters to Bishop Fisher (1489) about the unhealthiness of his palace (surely at Rochester), and to Dr. Francis on the causes of the sweating-sickness (1532), are well known. Vives, who was in Oxford most of the time, kept him in touch with events in England, and *e.g.* reported Linacre's death. There is no letter from or to More, only the dedication to young John More of the *Nux Elegia*, and the similar dedication of Prudentius' two hymns to Margaret Roper.

An interesting item is 1460, the preface to a new edition printed by Froben of a Greek-Latin lexicon. He says that he has omitted the Latin-Greek part as useless, partly because it was incomplete, partly because it would

only be useful for Greek prose; but for that you should read authors, and not get your vocabulary from dictionaries. Many scholars say the same to-day, but it puts rather a strain on the human memory. Erasmus did not attempt to rival Budé in writing whole letters in Greek himself, but wishes Budé had turned his attention to Greek lexicography. When a new edition of Graesse's invaluable *Orbis Latinus* was produced, the author omitted the German-Latin index on the ground that the writing of Latin prose had been discontinued in Germany. It is to be hoped that neither Greek nor Latin prose will ever be wholly neglected in this country, and lexicons will always be of some use for this purpose, though no doubt the reading of authors is, as Erasmus says, of the first importance towards writing either language well.

Besides the facsimile of Francis I.'s letter and two woodcuts of Erasmus, the volume is adorned by the two Holbein portraits of Erasmus, now in the Louvre and at Longford Castle, both of which were sent to England, one as a present to Warham.

G. C. RICHARDS.

De Graecorum fabulis satyricis scripsit Guilelmus Süss. (Acta et Commentationes Universitatis Dorpatensis B V. 4.) Pp. 15. Dorpat, 1924.

THIS is an unambitious but useful dissertation which treats of certain characteristics of the Greek satyric drama, without hazarding any new speculation on the vexed questions of its history and origin. The treatise bisects into two parts. The first points out that the satyric chorus was often in the forced service of a cruel ogre from which, at the end of the play, it was liberated: such were the *Amrysus*, *Cyclops*, *Busiris*, etc. Also, the satyrs were sometimes concerned with a newly-discovered benefit or divine gift, such as fire in the Aeschylean satyr-play *Prometheus*, the lyre in the *Ichnutae*, wine in the *Dionysiscus*. Heracles married Deianira, the daughter of Oeneus, the *ἵππος ἐπώνυμος* of wine: hence, perhaps, the explanation of the fragment in *Ox. Pap.* VIII. 60. The second part enters upon less familiar ground, and shows how the essential elements of the old satyr-plays were newly adapted by the poets known as the Alexandrian Pleias. In particular, attention is given to the plays of Sosithus, especially in relation to the stories of Daphnis and Lityerses. The writer's combinations are generally reasonable, but, if space permitted, it would be necessary to point out that they are not impeccable.

A. C. PEARSON.

Iconographie de l'Iphigénie en Tauride d'Euripide. By H. PHILIPPART. One Vol. Pp. 33. Eight figures in text. Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1925. Fr. 3.

THE treatment in art of subjects drawn from tragedy has an obvious archaeological and aesthetic interest, and Dr. Philippart lays special stress upon its value as evidence of the interpretation placed upon scenes in tragedy by the ancients themselves. He does little in the present pamphlet to work out this idea, but the materials for such a study are diligently collected. He gives a full catalogue, with a very complete list of references under each item, of the scenes from the *Iphigenia in Tauris* which are to be found on vases, gems, wall-paintings, sarcophagi, and other works of art, with the briefest of descriptions and discussions (except in one or two instances, where the treatment is rather more full). The pamphlet is of value as a sketch for a more detailed work, and as an illustration of the large amount of material available even in the case of a single play. A complete 'artistic companion' to Greek Tragedy would be a fine undertaking, but it would need many hands.

A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE.

Griechische Inschriften sprachlich erklärt. Von IVAR A. HEIKEL. Pp. viii + 117. Helsingfors, 1924. \$0.50.

THIS book contains translations into German of sixty-five inscriptions or parts of inscriptions,

starting with Attic and Ionic, and ending with Arcadian and Cyprian. The text is printed—without accents or breathings—of about one-third of the number. For the text of the remainder the reader is referred to Solmsen's *Inscriptiones Graecae ad illustrandas dialectos selectae* (Teubner). Professor Heikel explains the absence of text as due to the high cost of printing. The translations are preceded by references to the literature, which might economically have been omitted, as they are in Solmsen's book, which all users of this book must possess—and in a number of cases by brief notes on the alphabet. They are followed, or rather accompanied, by a commentary chiefly devoted to the explanation in detail of the phonology and morphology of the words occurring in the inscriptions. Professor Heikel says in his preface that the book is meant for beginners (presumably beginners in philology), and declares, 'Das Studium der griechischen Laut- und Formenlehre dürfte am erfolgreichsten mit der Lesung und sprachlichen Interpretation von Inschriften beginnen.' This is an extremely disputable thesis, and it is difficult to believe that the most painstaking beginner in philology will have any clear idea of Greek phonology and morphology after having worked through this book. To students of dialects the less elementary parts of the commentary and the translations, which, so far as I have tested them, are clear and generally correct, will doubtless be of use. Misprints and errors are commendably few. *There is no index.* Perhaps 'Anfänger' don't need one.

S. G. CAMPBELL.

Πενία ἐν πλοῦτος. Door JACOB HEMELRIJK. Pp. 152. Amsterdam: druk van Blikman en Sartorius.

A CAREFUL survey of the use in Greek, down to the fourth century, of πένης, πλούσιος, the cognate nouns, and other words for degrees of poverty or wealth; and a sensible study of Greek opinions on the pros and cons of these estates.

In so full a book one misses the passage of Aristophanes which might well serve as motto for a history of Athenian sea-power (*Eccles.* 197 f.):

ναὺς δέει καθέλκειν· τῷ πένητι μὲν δοκεῖ,
τοῖς πλουσίοις δὲ καὶ γεωργοῖς οὐ δοκεῖ.

For the sake of those who know not Dutch ten pages of summary in German are appended. The book is well got up.

E. HARRISON.

Georgii Lacapeni et Andronici Zaridae Epistulae XXXII. cum Epimerismis Lacapeni. Accedunt duae epistulae Michaëlis Gabrae ad Lacapenum. Edidit SIGFRID LINDSTAM. Pp. xvi+246. Götoborgi: Eranos' Förlag, 1924.

GEORGIUS LACAPENUS, who was contemporary with Thomas Magister (early fourteenth century), was, like him, interested in recovering and cultivating the purest Attic style. His letters are an elaborate *tour de force* in this kind of composition, and are accompanied by his own

notes on the vocabulary and syntax. His manner of commenting is very similar to that of Thomas. The *editio princeps* (1779) gave only excerpts, taken from an inferior MS. The present editor has already given an edition (1910) of the first ten letters, and in this new volume he presents us with the first complete text, basing it on numerous MSS. collated by himself in whole or in part. Lacapenus quotes classical writers freely, and the volume is provided with good indices of the passages cited and of the words discussed by Lacapenus. The edition makes a good impression.

R. MCKENZIE.

The Introduction of Characters by Name in Greek and Roman Comedy. By DAVID MARTIN KEY. Pp. 98. University of Chicago, 1923.

IF anyone desires to know how many characters in Greek and Roman Comedy are announced or mentioned by name by themselves or by others immediately after or before, or considerably after or before, but not at their first appearance, or are not named at all, or only long after their first appearance, he will find the answers to his questions diligently set forth in this Dissertation. He will also find answers to most of the possible variations of these questions, and estimates of the degree of naturalness or artificiality of each type of naming or omission to name. He will not find much to disagree with, though he may be surprised to find the uses of *ecce, hic, ille, is, incedit, venit, ὁρῶ, ἔρχεται, καὶ μὴν*, etc., labelled as mechanical conventions (p. 54), and may be inclined to ask what simpler or more natural expressions could be used, and to find in their naturalness a sufficient explanation of their frequency. (In fact, the writer's postulation of a conventional technique seems to be considerably overdone.) But if he asks whether classical scholarship is really reduced to this kind of investigation, and whether the undoubted industry of such scholars as the author might not be better applied, it may not be easy to give him a satisfactory answer. So long, however, as Universities in the United States and in Germany reward such work with a Doctorate, so long it will doubtless continue to be produced.

A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE.

The Writers of Greece. By GILBERT NORWOOD. Pp. 142. Clarendon Press: The World's Manuals. 2s. 6d. net.

THIS is a good short history of Greek literature. The plan of the book is excellent. First we have an Introductory Outline in which the development of the various literary forms is sketched. This, though it includes (in sixteen pages) all the important writers from Homer to Procopius, is full of interest. Professor Norwood then treats at comfortable length the fourteen most famous authors; thus he is able to give eight pages to Thucydides, sixteen to Plato. He shows throughout knowledge, judgment, taste, and he writes with a certain infectious enthusiasm. Some notion of the quality of each of the greater writers is given by short

pieces of translation, and well chosen pictures add to the value of the book.

This book may be obtained, bound up with Professor Wight Duff's *Writers of Rome*, for 4s. 6d., or printed on a larger page and very attractively bound in blue cloth for 7s. 6d.

W. E. P. PANTIN.

A Book of Latin Poetry from Ennius to Hadrian. Chosen and annotated by E. V. RIEU. Methuen. 2s. or 3s. 6d.

THIS is a good pocket anthology; it contains seventy-six pages of pieces which one is glad to recall. The notes, too, are interesting and helpful. Mr. Rieu has a gift for hitting off the characteristics of a poet in a few lines.

W. E. P. PANTIN.

Life Symbols as related to Sex Symbolism. By ELIZABETH E. GOLDSMITH, author of *Sacred Symbols in Art*, and *Toby: The Story of a Dog*. One vol. Pp. xxviii+455; 46 plates, 108 figures in text. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1924.

SYMBOLISM is recommended on the author's experience as a tonic for 'depression over world conditions.' Those whose constitutions such medicine may suit will here find the authentic 'mixture as before' with all the usual ingredients—ankhs, taus, swastikas, obelisks, trees of life, etc., with quotations from Bergson, Chesterton, Voltaire, Gilbert Murray, Ruskin, and others. The passage which gave me most pleasure is an engaging discussion of the donkey on p. 212: 'I have an inner conviction, truth to tell, that in an earlier civilisation he may have been my symbolic animal—or I the donkey.' It would be cantankerous to protest.

W. R. HALLIDAY.

Male Infibulation. By ERIC JOHN DINGWALL. One vol. Pp. vii+145, frontispiece, and seven figures in text. London: John Bale, Sons and Danielsson, Ltd., 1925. 10s. 6d.

THIS, the first volume in a projected series of *Studies in the Sexual Life of Ancient and Mediaeval Peoples*, is a serious study of an obscure and painful practice to which Martial mentions, the singing voice of actors, or the physical strength of athletes. For the earlier Greeks there is no literary evidence, but upon Etruscan mirrors and Attic vases athletes are sometimes represented with *ligatura praeputii*. This, Mr. Dingwall insists, differs both in method and purpose from Roman infibulation with a metal ring. Method we must concede, but as to purpose I am less clear. I am inclined to think that the origin of both methods as applied to athletes may lie in the supposed magical efficacy of continence, of which chastity taboos in ritual are a different expression. The author has also collected a good deal of anthropological material, but it is not marshalled very clearly, nor are the conclusions to be drawn from it very plain. He has been very unsuccessful in dealing with the printer's vagaries where he has quoted Greek, nor is the use of 'Attics' in the

sense of 'inhabitants of Attica' to be commended. But in the main his work is industrious and thorough; the examination of the literary allusions to this strange matter by classical writers and their earlier editors is, I should imagine, exhaustive.

W. R. HALLIDAY.

Où était Carthage? By E. C. HOWARD. Pp. 36; one large-scale map at end. Alger: Jules Carbonel, 1925.

THIS book is not an exhaustive study of the problem enunciated. 'L'hypothèse,' the author says, 'exposée dans cette étude n'est rien, naturellement, qu'une simple suggestion pour aider les recherches.' Two main propositions are put forward: (1) that the traditional view about the location of the Punic ports and Byrsa is untenable; (2) that the ports were at La Goulette, and that the city occupied the whole of the Goulette peninsula.

Mr. Howard's topographical indications are of the vaguest, and it is impossible to discover either from his map or from the letterpress the exact location he would ascribe to the two ports. His whole theory is based on two statements of Appian: that there was an entry to the ports *ἐς δὲ τὴν ἀπορώντα*, and that there was a *ravina* turned towards the west between the sea and the lake. As to the first, an unbiassed observer would say that the entry marked on the map is turned towards the east, while what Mr. Howard takes to be the *ravina*, though lying between the sea and the lake, yet *points N.E. and not W.*

The author gives no description of the lie of the ports; he does not seem to have studied in detail the topography of the Goulette peninsula—if he has, he certainly does not pass on his conclusions; the Byrsa he puts on the low slobland at the N.E. corner of the Lake of Tunis, in spite of the testimony of Strabo and others that it was an eminence;¹ and he makes light of the very real difficulty that no Punic remains have been found near Goulette.

After such a superficial exposition, Mr. Howard can hardly expect rival archaeologists to treat his theory seriously. Let him work out a full and detailed account of the possible emplacement of Carthage at Goulette, let him weigh carefully all available evidence from ancient sources, and let him embody his results in a much more exhaustive article. When he has done that, he may then have produced something worthy of the attention of all scholars interested in Punic archaeology.

The book is further marred by numerous errors and misprints. On p. 27 the island of Syracuse is actually called Ogygia, while misprints in the French text and in the Latin and Greek quotations abound on every page.

D. B. HARDEN.

¹ This difficulty he answers (p. 32) by suggesting that it was on an artificial mound, afterwards 'complètement rasée par l'armée romaine'!

Hippo Regius from the Earliest Times to the Arab Conquest. By H. VAN M. DENNIS. Pp. 74. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1924.

NO attempt has here been made to fit together a connected and comprehensive account of the history of Hippo Regius. Certain important topics (e.g. the archaeology and topography of the site) are entirely ignored, and others are treated in the most sketchy and superficial manner, while, on the contrary, much irrelevant and superfluous matter is introduced. There are, for instance, ten pages on the ethnology and languages of North Africa, a knowledge of which on the part of the reader might surely be assumed.

Quite half the book is taken up with an account of the Diocese of Hippo and its history in Christian times, and yet, strangely enough, the author deems fit to say very little about St. Augustine, the one really eminent man connected with Hippo in antiquity. The book is dully written, and the translations from the Latin (they fill nearly a quarter of the book) are distinctly schoolboyish in style. Still, these last two faults might be excused were the book in other respects interesting and original. But it is not; and the author does well in his preface to mention his 'particular indebtedness' to M. Gsell's various works.

There is a needlessly full bibliography at the end of the volume, which, nevertheless, has some notable omissions, e.g. Diehl's *L'Afrique Byzantine*, and Fischer's *Mittelmeerbilder*.

D. B. HARDEN.

A Literary History of Rome from the Origins to the Close of the Golden Age. By J. WIGHT DUFF. Pp. xvi+695. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1925. Cloth, 21s. net.

THE second edition of this work followed hard upon the first, which was very well received both by other journals and by this (XXIV., 1910, 65). No change appears to have been made in it since 1910; but its value is attested by the need of new impressions, the present being the sixth.

E. HARRISON.

Titii Livi ab urbe condita libri. Erklärt von W. WEISSENBORN und H. J. MÜLLER. Dritter Band, erstes Heft. Buch VI.-VIII., neubearbeitet von OTTO ROSSBACH. Sechste Auflage. Pp. 328. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1924. M. 5.40.

THIS is a new edition of the well-known annotated text of Livy by Weissenborn and Müller. As the fifth edition of these books appeared as far back as 1886, there was every reason for revising it and bringing it up to date. This has been done judiciously by Otto Rossbach. As the edition is primarily intended for school use, the references in the notes are mainly to standard works of a general character rather than to articles in special journals, though these are not always excluded. Thus Italian topography is elucidated by references to Nissen's *Italische Landeskunde*, Roman topography by Richter's *Topographie Roms*, and antiquities by

Pauly-Wissowa, Blümner, Mau, Baumeister, Müller-Wieseler, etc. One is glad to note that considerable stress is laid upon elucidating and illustrating the subject-matter, as well as upon the explanation of the text. The editor notes that he has been unable to make use of Ed. Meyer's study of the Roman manipular army which appeared in 1923, and is important for the well-known passage about the arrangement of the army in Book VIII.

An appendix gives critical notes in cases where the reading of the MSS. has been departed from, and the principal conjectures adopted by Madvig and C. Flamstead Walters in their editions of the text are noted. It is worth remarking that Rossbach calls Walters's edition 'diese jetzt massgebende Ausgabe.'

F. H. MARSHALL.

Poetae Latini Minores: post Aemilium Baehrens iterum recensuit FRIDERICUS VOLLMER. Vol. II., fasc. 2, *Ovidi Nux, Consolatio ad Liviam, Priapea.* Pp. 80. Lipsiae in aedibus B. G. Teubneri, 1923. 1 Mk. 60 Pf. BAEHRENS' useful collection of the lesser Latin poets began to appear in 1879. He was a diligent and successful searcher for MSS., but had an excessive penchant for emendation. The time for a new edition had certainly arrived, and Vollmer was among the best qualified Germans to undertake it. This is the last part we shall receive from his hands, as he was taken away when his task was more than half completed. It will be generally admitted that the work shows a real advance on its predecessor, and the apparatus differs even more seriously than the text. Vollmer has wisely got rid of Baehrens' excessive punctuation; in orthography Baehrens is sometimes better than Vollmer, especially where our MSS. are late. On p. 7, l. 23, for 'nunx' read 'nunc,' and on p. 17, for 'C. Clark' read 'A. C. Clark.'

A. SOUTER.

Der Satiredichter Horaz: die Weiterbildung einer römischen Literaturgattung. Von KURT WITTE. Erlangen, 1923, printed by the author. Pp. 39.

Die Geschichte der römischen Elegie, Erster Band. Tibull. Von KURT WITTE. Erlangen, 1924. Pp. iv+122.

THE aim of the first of these works is to show that Horace in the composition of the *Satires* was indebted to Virgil's *Eclogues* and *Georgics*, not only in the matter of technique, but also occasionally in phraseology. Martin Hertz long ago observed a relationship between the first satire of the first book and the *Georgics*; Dr. Witte carries this further. The work will repay study, as it is based on a minute analysis of the construction of the *Satires*.

The second work is a part of an ambitious programme, nothing less in fact than a history of Roman poetry in the Augustan Age. The projected work is to be in five parts, thus: First part, Virgil (in four volumes, dealing respectively with the *Bucolics*, *Georgics*, *Aeneid*, and *Pseudo-Vergiliana*); second part, Horace (in two volumes, one on the *Satires* and *Epistles*,

the other on the *Odes* and *Epodes*; third part, History of Roman Elegy (first volume, *Tibullus*, the one before us; second volume, *Propertius*; third volume, *Ovid*); fourth part, *Ovid's Metamorphoses*; fifth part, the *Art of the Roman-Hellenistic Poetry*. Some of the ground is meantime in part covered by works like that on Horace just described.

The *Tibullus* volume is analytical, minutely so. The author argues that Tibullus practised framing (*Umrahmung*) and the working into one another of unities (*ineinandergearbeitete Einheiten*) in the construction of his poems, and provides tables to show their literary construction. He also illustrates the literary relationship between Tibullus on the one hand, and Virgil and Horace respectively on the other. An index of passages discussed enables the reader to test the author's theories.

A. SOUTER.

Calpurnii et Nemesiani Bucolica iteratis curis editit Einsiedlensia quae dicuntur carmina adiecit CAESAR GIARRATANO. Pp. xxxiii + 94. Ex officina regia I. B. Paravia et Soc. Augustae Taur. Preface dated February, 1924.

It is a boon to get the *Einsiedeln* fragments in this handy form along with the other *Bucolica*; and this is a useful, convenient, and in every way meritorious book, well printed on good enough paper, and well edited. Giarratano gives a full account of the MS. evidence, a short apparatus criticus of variants, and an index nominum. His text is reasonable: only once does he offer the reader an incredible Latinity, at the vexat passage in *Calp. Buc. I. 54-57*, where it may be suggested that we should restore

*Candida Pax aderit, nec solum candida vultu
qualis saepe fuit quae libera marte professo
et domito procul hoste, tamen grassantibus
armis*

lubrica dissedit tacito Discordia ferro.

Codd. quae in 56 and *publica diffudit* in 57. Anyhow, *Pax* requires a capital, being personified, and *marte* does not.

In the same poem, v. 29, *resultant* should be read, according to this poet's usage in IV. 5.

Spellings like *cometem* (II. 78) and *Lycidam* (VII. 81) will alarm those who are delicate about these points. At III. 10 *Sic tua Phyllis?* is surely interrogative like *sic meos amores?* in Catullus. There are a few other errors: at V. 141 *Palatia*, not *palatia*; from VI. 47 *sine* is missing; in Nem. III. 28 *ulmis*, not *ulmis*.

J. S. PHILLIMORE.

Juvenal's Tenth Satire and Johnson's The Vanity of Human Wishes. With Introduction and Notes. By E. H. BLAKENEY, M.A. Pp. 78. London: Blackie and Son, 1925. 3s. 6d. net.

It was a happy thought to include Juvenal's satire and Johnson's imitation of it in one cover. Mr. Blakeney has added to each an introductory note and a brief commentary. The two poems are of equal length, but the Latin gets,

as it should for English readers, twice as much explanation. Yet Johnson is sometimes obscure enough: when he wrote (l. 50)

See motley life in modern trappings dress'd,
And feed with varied fools th' eternal jest,

surely 'feed' is an imperative addressed to Democritus, and not a participle, as the editor seems to understand it: in fact it = *pasce*, not *mercede conductam*. In l. 328 the sense is hidden by the misprint of 'latent fashion' for 'latest fashion.' But these are details; and the book is good in execution as well as in conception. Any student who has mastered throughout the meaning of these two famous poems has received a real piece of education.

J. D. DUFF.

De particulis copulativis apud Scriptores Historiae Augustae quaestiones selectae. Scripsit ERIK TIDNER (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift, 1922; Filosofi, Språkvetenskap och Historiska Vetenskaper 3). Pp. xii + 148. Uppsala: A.-B. Akademiska Bokhandeln. 7 kr. 50.

THIS monograph is one more of those careful investigations of the usage of later Latin writers which Uppsala has given to us. It is not a calculation of the number of instances of *et* in the *Historia Augusta*, but a carefully classified collection of the ways in which words and thoughts are joined. Such a conspectus is of value for the establishment of the text, and Dr. Tidner has not failed to consider problems which arise therein. Those specially interested in his subject should read a careful review by W. Baehrens, *Philologische Wochenschrift*, 1923, 362 ff.

A. D. NOCK.

Die Rechtstitel und Regierungsprogramme auf römischen Kaiserminzen (von Caesar bis Severus). Von Dr. OTTO TH. SCHULZ. Pp. x + 124. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1925. Marks 6.

DR. SCHULZ has chosen a promising subject, for which his past experience of Roman constitutional history well fits him—the use of the imperial coinage to state claims and announce policies. The work is well planned, skilfully arranged, and equipped with at least one useful index. It will undoubtedly be of great assistance to the historian in search of numismatic evidence. To a sound grasp of the main principles of the Roman constitution the author adds a good general knowledge of the coinage, and he combines the two with sense and judgment. So long as we are concerned with general principles rather than with details we shall not often find him misleading us.

More closely examined, the book has its blemishes. Far too much space is devoted to the demolition of Kenner's theory that the offering of an oak-wreath by the Senate to the Emperor as 'Saviour of his Country' was a regular symbol of the accession. But the element of truth underlying Kenner's theory is not fully appreciated. Schulz convinces himself far too readily that laurel-wreath and oak-wreath were confused, and does not fairly state

the other side of the case. He is too careless of detail—of questions of date, of mintage, of exact reference of type. A few examples must suffice. On p. 25 a wrong date is suggested for the 'autonomous' coins of Vitellius. On p. 23 stress is laid on the S.C. on a 'Hispania' reverse of a denarius of Galba; but no mention is made of what is probably the real point—that it was struck in the great senatorial province of Africa. On p. 28 nothing is said of the Spanish origin of the As of Vitellius with reverse *CONSENSVS HISPANIARVM S.C.*—again a vital point. Remarks on the kindred types of 'Providentia' and 'Spes' on pp. 36, 42, 48, 70, might have been made more precise. On p. 53 the meaning of the words 'populi iussu' on the reverse of a denarius of Octavian is forced; they apply directly to the reverse type, an equestrian statue. On p. 89 Schulz writes as if he did not know that patera and sceptre are rather common attributes of gods. On pp. 91 ff. Schulz's view of the candidature of Clodius Macer is only reasonable if Macer's coins were mainly struck before the death of Nero; the evidence is in favour of a later date. It is only fair to add that the book contains much wise and enlightening comment. Mistakes of the kind we have noted are inevitable in a work on this scale. But, unless Dr. Schulz will take the detail of coins a little more seriously, he will make more than he need.

H. MATTINGLY.

Saint Cyprien: Correspondance. Tome I. Texte établi et traduit par le CHANOINE BAYARD. Pp. lx + 200. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1923. Fr. 12

THIS is a very welcome volume. Its editor is well known as an authority on Cyprian, on whose Latinity he gave us a scholarly thesis in 1902. He has taken full advantage of the work done by Mercati, von Soden, and Miodonski since the appearance of the Vienna edition in 1868, and his text is an undoubted improvement upon Hartel's. The translation has been carefully done, and is both accurate and lucid. There is an excellent introduction, in which students will be grateful for the succinct summary of the information supplied by the correspondence on the condition and constitution of the African Church in the third century. The editor has done his work well, and when completed it will take its place among the most independent and valuable of this *Belles Lettres* series.

J. H. BAXTER.

A Study of the Vocabulary and Rhetoric of the Letters of St. Augustine. By W. PARSONS. Pp. vii + 281. 1923.

St. Augustine the Orator. By M. I. BARRY. Pp. xi + 263. 1924.

The Clausulae in the De Civitate Dei of St. Augustine. By G. REYNOLDS. Pp. ix + 67. 1924.

(The Catholic University of America Patristic Studies, Vols. III., VI., VIII. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America. Paper.)

EACH of these three theses for the Ph.D. degree is concerned with the Latinity of St. Augustine.

Sister Wilfrid Parsons devotes the five chapters of Part I. to the vocabulary, and the three of Part II. to the style of the *Letters*, reserving the syntax for separate treatment. The best chapter in Part I. is that on semantics, with copious illustrations. In Part II. all the tropes and figures occurring in the *Letters* are carefully tabulated. The work is well done, and was worth doing.

Sister M. Inviolata Barry appraises the rhetoric of the *Sermons*. This also is a useful piece of work, and perhaps of more general interest, for what is true of Augustine the preacher is also true of Augustine the dogmatic theologian.

Both these theses have select bibliographies (Sister W. Parsons prints Rogers for Roger), but neither quotes Dr. Watson's monograph on *The Style and Language of St. Cyprian* (Oxford, 1896). Mr. Graham Reynolds has the advantage of them and refers to Dr. Watson (though with misplaced initials) in the bibliography to his essay on *The Clausulae in the De Civ. Dei*. This is a much shorter affair, but it is, as far as I can judge, of considerable importance in the history of Latin prose. Mr. Reynolds applies to St. Augustine (with modifications) the method of Zielinski, whose great work, *Das Clauselgesetz in Cicero's Reden*—or, at least, Professor A. C. Clark's article thereupon in this *Review* (Vol. XIX., pp. 164-172)—is indispensable to the comprehension of the thesis, either as prelude or accompaniment. It is stiff reading, and Mr. Reynolds's English is slightly American; but he is a writer who is sure to appear again, and whom we shall be glad to meet. He tells us in Chap. I. what were Augustine's own views and practice in regard to the *clausula*; Chap. II. contains an analysis into seven groups of 4,274 *clausulae* of the *D.C.D.* This leaves 60,000 or 70,000 to be accounted for; but the distribution of the passages examined renders it probable that they are representative. Chap. III. deals with individual *clausulae*, and Chap. IV. consists of miscellaneous remarks on prosody and accent.

It may safely be affirmed that the three dissertations between them form a distinct contribution to knowledge.

H. F. STEWART.

A Comparison of the Styles of Gaudentius of Brescia (21 Tractates or Sermons); the De Sacramentis (ascribed to St. Ambrose); and the Didascalia Apostolorum, or Fragmenta Veronensia (E. Hauler). By AUSTIN HEDLEY BIRCH. Pp. 180. Yendall and Co., Ltd., Printers, Risca, Mon., 1924. 10s.

THE subject of this tractate was suggested to the author by Professor Vernon Bartlet, of Mansfield College, Oxford. The reason for grouping these three works is to be found in the fact that they all belong to North Italy. This region was for about half a century (from 375 to 425) one of great importance in Latin Christianity, and a very considerable body of Christian literature was produced there. This is Dr. Birch's first venture in authorship, and shows some signs of inexperience as well as want of access to a large library. The book also is printed at a somewhat obscure provincial press, little used to the production of learned

works, and in consequence there is a fair crop of misprints. Nevertheless, the work is a real contribution to learning, and will prove of value to all investigators of the later Latin. The copious data furnished have made it quite clear that neither the *De Sacramentis* nor the *Didascalica* is the work of Gaudentius, and that in fact all three works come from different authors. The fact that Hauler's edition of the *Didascalica*,

important as it is for the student of palaeography and orthography, is now out of print, adds considerably to the value of Dr. Birch's work. The author includes a very considerable selection of the scriptural quotations made in these three writings, and here again has done good service to the student of the Latin Bible. May other busy schoolmasters be encouraged to follow his example !
A. SOUTER.

OXFORD PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

THE following papers were read :

October 23, 'Notes on the Turning March of the Persians at Thermopylae,' by Professor J. A. Smith.

November 6, 'The Younger Pliny,' by Dr. J. A. Nairn.

November 20, 'The Date and Occasion of the 2nd Pythian, with a note on Ol. VI. 82 (140) ft.,' by Mr. D. S. Robertson.

November 27, 'The New Excavations at Ostia and Pompeii,' by Dr. E. N. Gardner.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

CLASSICAL WEEKLY (NEW YORK). (1925.)

ARCHAEOLOGY.—October 12. A. W. Barker, *A Classification of the Chitons worn by Greek Women as shown in Works of Art* [University of Pennsylvania Dissertation, 1923] (Lillian M. Wilson). Unfavourable. Shows errors due to the study of mere photographic reproductions, with no practical knowledge of the way the sculptor and painter worked.

GRAMMAR.—November 9. R. J. Cunliffe, *Lexicon of the Homeric Dialect* [London: Blackie, 1924] (S. E. Bassett). Rather faintly praised.

HISTORY.—October 19. T. S. Jerome, *Aspects of the Study of Roman History* [New York: Putnam, 1923] (W. D. Gray). Studies by a late consular agent who was not a professional scholar. Sympathetic review, which stresses J.'s use of modern psychology.—October 26. L. Homo, *L'Italie Primitive et les Débuts de l'Impérialisme Romain* [Paris, 1925] (H. Wing). 'A summing up of the chief lines of development conceived in political and geographical terms,' but neglecting economic and social influences.—November 9. H. Dessau, *Geschichte der Römischen Kaiserzeit. I. Band: Bis zum Ersten Thronwechsel* [Berlin: Weidmann, 1924] (F. B. Marsh). Highly praised; but M. criticises D. for ignoring the dyarchy established by Augustus, and for refusing to see any development in his policy.

LITERATURE.—November 16. D. M. Robinson, *Sappho and her Influence* [Boston: Marshall Jones, 1924; in *Our Debt to Greece and Rome*] (F. G. Allinson). Long review, mainly favourable.—December 7. Mary A. Grant, *Ancient Rhetorical Theories of the Laughable: The Greek Rhetoricians and Cicero* [University of Wisconsin Dissertation, 1924] (L. Van Hook). Praised, though reviewer

notes errors (one very bad one) and omissions.—W. Nestle, *Geschichte der Griechischen Literatur* [Berlin: De Gruyter, 2 vols., 1923, 1924] (J. Hammer). Praised; but the work, which only runs to 281 pages, is uneven, lyrists, orators, and new-comedians receiving less than their due.—December 14. A. Y. Campbell, *Horace: A New Appreciation* [London: Methuen, 1924] (J. W. Duff). An instructive and provocative book, which lays due stress on the religious, moral, and social value of Horace.

RELIGION.—October 26. A. Le Marchant, *Greek Religion in the Time of Hesiod* [Manchester: Sherratt and Hughes, 1923] (W. S. Fox). Favourable. 'Written in a style of unusual freshness.'

[The issues of October 12, November 9 and 30, and December 7, contain lists of articles on classical subjects in non-classical periodicals.]

MUSÉE BELGE, XXIX, No. 4. (OCTOBER, 1925.)

J. P. Waltzing, *Le Crime rituel reproché aux Chrétiens du II^e Siècle*. Follows phases of the pagan charges of *flagitia* down to the more precise versions in Minucius and Tertullian: these last differ notably, M. being the earlier.—Cam. Bottin, *Les Tribus et les Dynasties de l'Épire avant l'Influence macédonienne, IV. Molossian kings of 418-352 B.C. and their relations with Athens, Dionysius, etc.* Concludes account of this *peuple fruste*, backward but proud. 'Very plausible' that Eur. *Andromache* was played at court of Tharyps.—N. Hohlwein, *Le Stratège du Nome VI. (conclusion)*. His powers regarding liturgies: changes in 3rd A.D. with *Βουλαι* of metropolis. Agrees with Oertel that under Ptolemies there were *corvée* and forced labour, but the *fonctionnarisme forcé* of Roman period was very exceptional.

MUSÉE BELGE: BULLETIN BIBLIOGRAPHIQUE ET PÉDAGOGIQUE,
XXX., Nos. 1-3. (JANUARY, 1926.)

J. Mansion, *Le Problème saxon*. Discusses recent theories of point of departure of Saxons for England and of connotation of *litus Saxonicum*.

GREEK.—*Demosthenes*: E. Drerup, *Dem. im Urtheile des Altertums*, 1923. A bad quarter of an hour for Dem. and lawyer-politicians, but of real value (J. Meunier). *Plato*: A. Willem, *Apologie* (éd. classique), Liège, Des-sain. Favourable (R. Scalais).

LATIN.—J. G. P. Borleffs, *De Tertulliano et Minucio Felice*. Groningen, Wolters, 1925. Successful case for priority of M. (G. Hinns-daels).

GENERAL.—A. Carnoy, *Gramm. élém. de la Langue sanscrite comparée avec celles des Langues indo-eur.* Paris, Geuthner, 1925. Subject too vast and complex for an elementary manual (J. Mansion).—A. Meillet, *Les Origines indo-eur. des Métres grecs*. Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1923. Favourable (R. Fohalle).—C. Autran, *Introd. à l'Étude critique du Nom propre grec. Fasc. I.-III.* Geuthner, 1925, 20 fr. each. Has shown better than anyone difficulty of the problem (R. Fohalle).—*Catalogue des MSS. alchimiques grecs. I. Les Parisini, and III. Les MSS. des Îles Britanniques*. Brussels, Lamertin, 1924. Favourable (M. Delcourt).—F. Hartmann, *L'Agriculture dans l'ancienne Égypte*. Paris, 1923. Learned (R. Scalais).—C. Huart, *La Perse antique et la Civilisation iranienne* (Évol. de l'Humanité). Indispensable (Anon.).—A. Grenier, *Le Génie romain dans la Religion, la Pensée et l'Art* (same series). Favourable (Anon.).

PHILOLOGISCHE WOCHENSCHRIFT.
(JULY-OCTOBER, 1925.)

GREEK LITERATURE.—W. Aly, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur* [Bielefeld and Leipzig, 1925, Velhagen u. Klasing. Pp. xvii+418] (Kunst). Undertakes, with great success, a systematic history not of Greek writers, but of Greek writings; brings out very clearly the real driving forces in Greek literature, and concentrates more than is usually done on literary form. Reviewer praises very emphatically.

LATIN LITERATURE.—W. Kroll, *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur* [Stuttgart, 1924, Metzler. Pp. 390] (Helm). K.'s book entirely justifies the claim of its title to 'promote the understanding of Latin literature'; contains a wealth and variety of important matter which reviewer summarises in considerable detail.—*Seneca: Phaedra*. Herausg. u. erläutert. von K. Kunst [Wien, 1924. Pp. 66 and 87] (Klotz). Primarily a school edition, but stimulating and useful also to experts. Vol. I. contains a good introduction, followed by text, critical appendix, and historical review of *Phaedra* in dramatic art to the present day; in Vol. II. K. gives a

running commentary which hardly once leaves us in the lurch.

HISTORY.—*Rom, Geschichte des römischen Volkes und seiner Kultur, von W. Wägner*. Neu bearbeitet von O. E. Schmidt; 10. Aufl. [Berlin, n.d., Neufeld u. Henius. Pp. xvi+706; 293 illustrations] (Poland). This new edition shows material changes, which bring it level with modern research; warmly recommended both for its reliability and for its lively and fascinating exposition. Reviewer finds treatment of Roman religion less satisfactory than the rest.

PHILOSOPHY.—*Stoicorum veterum fragmenta coll. I. ab Arnim. Vol. IV. quo Indices continentur*. Conscriptis M. Adler [Leipzig, 1924, Teubner. Pp. viii+221] (Pohlenz). This very serviceable index-volume has long been needed. Reviewer welcomes its appearance with gratitude.—E. von Aster, *Platon* [Stuttgart, 1925, Strecker u. Schröder. Pp. xii+167] (Nestle). Sane and clear. Recommended as an introduction, but contains little new for experts, except in concluding section, which sketches the influence of Platonic philosophy from Aristotle to the present day.—E. Hoffmann, *Die Sprache und die archaische Logik* [Tübingen, 1925, Mohr. Pp. viii+79] (Nestle). H. advances research in every branch of the subject he handles; might almost be called a Genealogy of Greek Logic.—O. Dittrich, *Die Systeme der Moral. Geschichte der Ethik vom Altertum bis zur Gegenwart. Bd. I.: Altertum bis zum Hellenismus. Bd. II.: Vom Hellenismus bis zum Ausgang des Altertums* [Leipzig, 1923, Quelle u. Meyer. Pp. viii+374 and vii+311] (Nestle). Contains considerably more than the title suggests; ethical systems not only described, but their metaphysical foundation considered in detail. Notes, references to sources, bibliography, and very full index are appended. Very interesting and instructive.

LANGUAGE AND METRE.—G. Rohlf, *Griechen und Romanen in Unteritalien. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der unteritalienischen Gräzität* [Geneva, 1924, Olschki. Pp. viii+178; 6 illustrations and 1 map] (Hermann). Proves convincingly that certain present-day dialects of S. Italy derive directly from Greek colonisation of classical times; deserves careful notice.—Thea Stiffler, *Das Wer-nickesche Gesetz und die bukolische Dihärese* [*Philologus* LXXIX., pp. 323-354, Leipzig, 1924] (Hommel). Exemplary in method and of greatest importance for Homeric metre. S. has 'overthrown a scientific dogma that had held the field unchallenged for a century,' and shows that the hexameter did not grow out of a dactylic tetrapody + an adonic dipody.

ARCHAEOLOGY.—W. R. Bryan, *Italic Hut Urns and Hut Urn Cemeteries: A Study in the Early Iron Age of Latium and Etruria* [Rome, 1925, American Academy. Pp. xiv+204; 25 illustrations] (Karo). Full description of the cemeteries, followed by a short account of early Iron Age in Latium, list of urns, index, and plates. Reviewer expresses much gratitude, but misses a corresponding chapter on early Iron Age in Etruria.

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on Classical Studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

* * Excerpts or Extracts from Periodicals and Collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

- Abbott (G. F.)** Thucydides. A study in historical reality. Pp. vii + 240. London: Routledge, 1925. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Allen (P. S.)** Erasmus' Services to Learning. Pp. 20. (Annual Lecture on a Master-mind; from the Proceedings of the British Academy.) London: Milford. Paper, 1s. 6d. net.
- Barwick (C.)** Flavi Sospatri Charisii Artis Grammaticae Libri V. Pp. xxvi + 539. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubn.) Leipzig: Teubner, 1925. Paper, G.-M. 12; cloth, 14.
- Birch (A. H.)** A comparison of the styles of Gaudentius of Brescia, the De Sacramentis and the Didascalia Apostolorum. Pp. 180. Risca (Mon.): Yendall, 1924. Paper, 10s.
- Bolling (G. M.)** The External Evidence for Interpolation in Homer. Pp. xii + 258. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925. Cloth, 21s. net.
- Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budd.** No. 9. Octobre, 1925.
- Classical Philology.** Vol. XX., No. 4. October, 1925.
- Corcoran (T.)** Renovatio Litterarum in scholas saec. a. C. XVI. deducta. Pp. xvii + 237. Dublin: The University, 1925. Paper.
- Crexells (J.)** Plato, Diálogos, II. Cármides, Lisis, Protágoras. Text i traducció de J. C. Barcelona: Fundació Bernat Metge, 1925. Stiff paper.
- De Franco (E.)** L' 'Inverno' Esiodo e le Opere e i Giorni. Pp. 39. Catania: V. Muglia, 1926. Paper, 4 lire.
- Delachaux (A.)** Notes critiques sur Thucydide (Livre I.). Pp. 73. Neuchâtel (Switzerland): Secrétariat de l'Université, 1925. Paper, 5 fr.
- Dennis (C. P. L.)** C. Valeri Catulli Carmen LXIV. A Prothalamion for Peleus and Thetis. Translated by C. P. L. D. Pp. 18. London: Burns Oates and Washbourne, 1925. Stiff paper, 1s. 3d.
- Diehl (E.)** Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres. Vol. II, fasc. 1. Pp. 80. Berlin: Weidmann, 1925. Paper, 3.75 M.
- Drexel (F.)** Achmetis Oneirocriticon. Pp. xvi + 270. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubn.) Leipzig: Teubner, 1925. Paper, 10 G.-M.; cloth, 11.40.
- Duckett (E. S.)** Catullus in English Poetry. Pp. 199. (Smith College Classical Studies, No. 6.) Northampton (Mass.), June, 1925. Paper.
- Engelmann (W.)** New Guide to Pompeii. Pp. 219; frontispiece, 140 figures, and map. Leipzig: Engelmann, 1925. Cloth, 5 G.-M.
- Fraenkel (E.)** Die Stelle des Römertums in der humanistischen Bildung. Pp. 45. Berlin: Weidmann, 1926. Paper, 1.50 M.
- Frödin (O.) and Persson (A. W.)** Rapport préliminaire sur les fouilles d'Asiné, 1922-1924. Pp. 23-93; 48 plates. (Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund. Årsberättelse 1924-1925, H. 2.) Lund: Gleerup (London: Milford), 1925. Paper.
- Game (J. B.)** Teaching High-school Latin. A handbook. Revised edition. Pp. xi + 151. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1925. Cloth.
- Gardiner (E. N.)** Olympia: its History and Remains. Pp. xviii + 316; 129 illustrations. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925. Cloth, 50s. net.
- Gerstinger (H.)** Bruchstücke eines antiken Kommentars zur Archäologie des Thukydides im Papyr. gr. Vindob. 29247. Pp. 20. (Akad. der Wiss. in Wien, Phil.-hist. Klasse, Denkschriften, 67. Band, 2. Abh.) Vienna and Leipzig: Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1925. Paper.
- Halliday (W. R.)** The pagan background of early Christianity. Pp. xvi + 334. (The Ancient World.) Liverpool: University Press (London: Hodder and Stoughton), 1925. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Havel (L.) et Fréty (A.)** Pseudo-Plaute, Le Prix des Ânes (Asinaria). Texte établi et traduit. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres.' Paper, 15 fr.
- Henry (M. Y.)** The relation of dogmatism and scepticism in the philosophical treatises of Cicero. Pp. viii + 117. Geneva (New York): W. F. Humphrey, 1925. Paper.
- Holland (L. A.)** The Faliscans in Pre-historic Times. Pp. xi + 162, 13 plates. (Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome, Vol. V.) Rome: American Academy, 1925. Cloth.
- Hosius (C.)** Die Moselgedichte des Decimus Magnus Ausonius und des Venantius Fortunatus zum dritten Male herausgegeben und erklärt, mit einer Karte und Abbildungen. Pp. 126. Marburg i. H.: N. G. Elwert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1926. Paper, 3 M.
- Humbert (J.)** Les plaidoyers écrits et les plaidoiries réelles de Cicéron. Pp. 296. Contribution à l'étude des sources d'Asconius dans ses relations des débats judiciaires. Pp. 142. Paris: Les Presses Universitaires de France. Paper.
- Jespersen (O.)** Mankind, nation and individual from a linguistic point of view. Pp. 222. (Institutet for Sammenlignende Kulturforskning.) Oslo: H. Aschehoug and Co. (London: Williams and Norgate), 1925. Paper.
- Kalinka (E.) und Kunst (K.)** Kurzgefasste griechische Sprachlehre mit Übungsstücken. Pp. 152. Vienna: Österreichischer Bundesverlag, 1925. Boards, 4.50 Kronen.
- Kolon (P. B.)** Die Vita S. Hilarii Arelatensis. Eine eidographische Studie. Pp. 124. Rhetorische Studien, 12. Heft.) Paderborn: Schöningh, 1925. Paper, 8 M.
- Krahe (H.)** Die alten balkanillyrischen geographischen Namen. Pp. x + 128. (Indogermanische Bibliothek, 3. Abt., 7.) Heidelberg: Winter, 1925. Geheftet, 5 M.
- Lehmann (P.)** Fuldaer Studien. Pp. 53. (Bay. Sitzungsberichte, Philos.-philol. u. hist. Kl., Jahrgang 1925, 3. Abh.) Munich: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1925. Paper.

- Llobera** (I. M. et **Estelrich** (I.)) M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes I., Pro P. Quinctio, Pro Sex. Roscio, Pro Q. Roscio Comoedo, Pro Tullio. Recognoverunt I. M. Ll. and I. E. Pp. ix+128. Barcelona: Editorial Catalana, S. A., 1923. Paper.
- Lobel** (E.) ΣΑΠΦΟΥΣ ΜΕΛΗ. The fragments of the lyrical poems of Sappho, edited by E. L. Pp. lxxviii+81. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925. Cloth, 21s. net.
- Lodge** (G.) Lexicon Plautinum. Vol. I. Fasc. I. et II., impressio correcta (1925); III.-X. (1904-1924). Pp. xvi+917. Leipzig: Teubner. Paper, each fasc. 7.20 G.-M.
- Lorimer** (W. L.) Some notes on the text of Pseudo-Aristotle 'De Mundo.' Pp. xi+148. (St. Andrews University Publications, No. XXI.) London: Milford, 1925. Paper, 5s. net.
- Ludvikovský** (J.) Řecký Román Dobrodružný, Studie o Jeho Podstatě a Vzniku. Le Roman grec d'Aventures, Étude sur sa Nature et son Origine. Pp. 160. (Facultas Philosophica Universitatis Carolinae Pragensis, XI.) Prague: F. Rivišák, 1925. Paper, 18 Kč.
- Mackail** (J. W.) Classical Studies. Pp. vii+253. London: Murray, 1925. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Macnaghten** (H.) The poems of Catullus done into English verse. Pp. viii+157. Cambridge: University Press, 1925. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Meillet** (A.) La méthode comparative en linguistique historique. Pp. viii+117. (Institutet for Sammenlignende Kulturforskning, Serie A: Forelesninger, II.) Oslo: H. Aschehoug and Co. (London: Williams and Norgate), 1925.
- Menk** (E. A.) The position of the possessive pronoun in Cicero's orations. Pp. 71. Grand Forks, North Dakota: Normanden Pub. Co., 1925. Paper.
- Mountford** (J. F.) Quotations from Classical Authors in Medieval Latin Glossaries. Pp. 132. (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, Vol. XXI.) New York and London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1925. Boards, \$1.50.
- Murray** (G.) The Eumenides (The Furies) of Aeschylus translated into rhyming verse. Pp. xv+63. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1925. Cloth, 3s.
- Murray** (R. H.) The History of Political Science from Plato to the Present. Pp. vii+435. Cambridge: Heffer, 1926. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Oehler** (R.) Mythologische Exempla in der älteren griechischen Dichtung. Pp. 126. Aarau: H. R. Sauerländer, 1925. Paper.
- Palaeographia Latina**, Part IV. Edited by W. M. Lindsay. (St. Andrews University Publications, XX.) Pp. 85. London: Milford, 1925. Paper.
- Paton** (W. R.), **Wegehaupt** (I.), **Pohlens** (M.) Plutarchi Moralia. Vol. I. Pp. xlvi+354. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubn.) Leipzig: Teubner, 1925. Paper, 10 G.-M.; cloth, 11.60.
- Phillimore** (J. S.) Pastoral and Allegory. A re-reading of the Bucolics of Virgil. Pp. 32. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925. Paper, 2s. net.
- Post** (L. A.) Thirteen Epistles of Plato. Introduction, translation and notes by L. A. P. Pp. 167. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Radet** (Georges). Notes critiques sur l'Histoire d'Alexandre. Première Série. Pp. 86. Bordeaux: Feret et Fils, 1925. Paper.
- Riba** (C.) i **Navarro** (A.) D. M. Ausoni Obres, Vol. I. Text i traducció. Barcelona: Editorial Catalana, S.A., 1924. Paper.
- Rivaud** (A.) Platon. Tome X.: Timée, Critias. Texte établi et traduit par A. R. Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1925. Paper, 20 fr.
- Ross** (W. D.) The Works of Aristotle translated into English. Ethica Nicomachea. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925. Paper, 6s. net; cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Sargent** (R. L.) The size of the slave population at Athens during the fifth and fourth centuries before Christ. Pp. 136. (University of Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences, Vol. XII., No. 3, September, 1924). Urbana: University of Illinois. Paper, \$1.75.
- Siedler** (C. W.) Latin. A concise grammar and drill book. Pp. 144. New York: Globe Book Company. Paper.
- Sjögren** (H.) M. Tulli Ciceronis Vol. IX., Epistularum ad Familiares Libri I.-XVI. Pp. vii+578. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubn.) Leipzig: Teubner, 1925. Cloth, 16 G.-M.
- Sonnenschein** (E. A.) What is Rhythm? An Essay accompanied by an appendix on experimental syllable-measurement. Pp. viii+228. Oxford: Blackwell, 1925. 10s. 6d. net.
- The American Journal of Philology**. Vol. XLVI. 4. Whole No. 184. October, November, December, 1925.
- The Cambridge Ancient History**. Edited by J. B. Bury, etc. Vol. III. The Assyrian Empire. Pp. xxv+821. Cambridge: University Press, 1925. Cloth, 35s.
- The Journal of Roman Studies**. Vol. XIV. 1923. Parts 1 and 2.
- The Year's Work in Classical Studies**, 1924-1925. Edited by D. S. Robertson.
- Trannoy** (A. I.) Marc-Aurèle, Pensées. Texte établi et traduit par A. I. T. Préface d' A. Puech. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1925. Paper, 20 fr.
- Werner** (H.) Die galenische Otologie. Inaug.-Diss. Pp. 31. Zürich: Leemann and Co. 1925.
- Williams** (W. W.) and **Mills** (B. V. R.) Select Treatises of S. Bernard of Clairvaux. De diligendo Deo, edited by W. W. W.; De gradibus humilitatis et superbiae, edited by B. V. R. M. Pp. ix+169. (Cambridge Patristic Texts.) Cambridge: University Press, 1926. Cloth, 10s. net.
- Winans** (J. A.) Studies in Rhetoric and Public Speaking in Honor of J. A. W., by Pupils and Colleagues. Pp. 299. New York: The Century Co., 1925. Cloth.
- Zilsel** (E.) Die Entstehung des Geniebegriffes. Ein Beitrag zur Ideengeschichte der Antike und des Frühkapitalismus. Pp. viii+346. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1926. Paper, 12 M.

3-
5-
e
r-
s,
i-
s.
:
5.
s-
a.
s.
a-
h
y
s,
:
ar
e
r,
I.
.)
n
i-
8.
ol.
n-
oy
un
r-
v.
4-
te
A.
le
es
y-
o.
ct
De
De
oy
ge
ty
ic
ad
n-
s.
te
6.
r,